DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 404 811 EC 305 329

AUTHOR	Neel, Richard S.; Meadows, Nancy B.
TITLE	Research for Educating Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Pupils. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Washington Univ., Seattle. Experimental Education Unit.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	31 Aug 91
CONTRACT	H023M80002
NOTE	206p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Behavior Change; *Emotional Disturbances; Identification; Inclusive Schools; Intermediate Grades; *Interpersonal Competence; *Intervention; Junior High Schools; Measurement Techniques; Peer Relationship; Research Methodology; Skill Development; Social Integration; Surveys; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This project conducted a series of 11 studies over a period of 3 years to investigate the social skill competence of approximately 200 upper elementary and middle school children with serious emotional disturbances. The project identified a set of social tasks which proved critical in discriminating between socially competent and incompetent children; developed measures that reliably identified behaviors children use in negotiating problematic social tasks; and incorporated critical social tasks, situations, and behaviors into the development and evaluation of a social skills instructional package. The efficacy and validity of the identification and treatment system are evaluated in terms of changes in the judgments of persons familiar with the children with serious emotional disturbances, changes in directly observable social behavior, and the degree to which those changes facilitated the integration of the children into regular education settings. The report includes summaries of each of the studies. Appendices include study findings, including lists of social tasks that identify the socially incompetent child, a list of social tasks that are difficult for children, a critical task taxonomy, the interview form used to interview the students, and a description of a model intervention for social skills instruction. Appendices also include the following papers: "Determining Social Tasks: A Preliminary Report" (Richard S. Neel and Nancy Meadows); "Creating an Initial Critical Social Task Taxonomy" (Susan G. Gelhar); and "Replacement Behaviors: A Strategy for Teaching Social Skills to Children with Behavior Problems" (Richard S. Neel and K. Kay Cessna). (Contains 53 references.) (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 404 811

RESEARCH FOR EDUCATING SERIOUSLY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED PUPILS

CFDA 84.023M1 H023M80002

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FINAL REPORT

SEPTEMBER 1, 1988 - AUGUST 31, 1991

DR. RICHARD S. NEEL
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

DR. NANCY B. MEADOWS
PROJECT COORDINATOR

EXPERIMENTAL EDUCATION UNIT
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND MENTAL RETARDATION CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98195

EC305329

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Final Report Outline: Research for Educating Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Pupils

I. Abstract

II. Text

- A. Conceptual framework
- B. Development of project objectives
- C. Summary of studies by objective
    - 1. Study Series -- Objective One
    - 2. Study Series -- Objective Two
    - 3. Study Series -- Objective Three
- D. Management and Project Personnel
    - 1. Table 1: Project Personnel
- E. Dissemination of Results
    - 1. Table 2:Dissemination of Products from Studies 1 - 4
    - 2. Table 3 Dissemination of Products from Studies 5 - 8
    - 3. Table 4 Dissemination of Products from Studies 9 - 11
- F. References

III. Appendices

- A. Appendix A. Determining Social Tasks: A Preliminary Report (Neel, Meadows, & Scott, 1990)
- B. Appendix B. Social Task List (Upper Elementary: 4th -- 6th Grade)
  Social Task List (Junior High: 7th -- 9th Grade)
- C. Appendix C. A Broad Validation of Critical Social Tasks
- D. Appendix D. Creating an Initial Critical Social Task Taxonomy (Gelhar, 1989)
- E. Appendix E. Cross-Validating a List of Problematic Social Tasks
- F. Appendix F. A Validation of Social Skills for Students with Behavior Disorders (Meadows, Neel, Parker & Timo, 1991)
- G. Appendix G. Interviewing Students to Investigate Problematic Social Tasks
- H. Appendix H. Preliminary Development of an Observation Protocol

I. Appendix I. Academic and Social Behaviors of Mainstreamed and Non-Mainstreamed Students with Serious Behavior Disorders

J. Appendix J. Social Competency, Mainstreaming, and Children with Serious Behavioral Disorders (Meadows, 1991)

K. Appendix K. Investigating the Mainstream Environments of Students with Behavior Disorders

L. Appendix L. Mainstream Environments of Students with Serious Behavior Disorders

M. Appendix M. Replacement Behaviors: A Strategy for Teaching Social Skills to Children with Behavior Problems (Neel & Cessna, in press)

N. Appendix N. Social Skills Training

O. Appendix O. Maybe This Behavior Does Make Sense (Neel & Cessna, 1990)

Research for Educating Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Pupils

Abstract

This project is conducting a series of eleven studies over a period of three years to investigate social skill competence of seriously emotionally disturbed pupils. In Washington state, such children are classified as having *serious behavior disability* (SBD). The project's major objectives are: (1) to identify a set of critical social tasks which prove critical in discriminating between socially competent and incompetent children; (2) to develop measures that reliably identify behaviors (social skills) children use in negotiating problematic social tasks; and (3) to incorporate critical social tasks, situations, and behaviors in the development and evaluation of a social skills instructional package. The efficacy and validity of the identification and treatment system will be evaluated in terms of changes in the judgements of persons familiar with the pupils with SBD, changes in directly observable social behavior, and the degree to which those changes facilitate the meaningful integration of pupils with SBD into regular education settings.

Studies were conducted in Washington and Colorado within upper elementary and middle school classrooms. Approximately 200 handicapped pupils, 250 non-handicapped pupils, 80 special education teachers, 90 regular education teachers, 50 specialists, and 50 social skills researchers are involved in one or more of the proposed studies. Data collection methods included Delphi and other survey techniques, direct observation of SBD and non-handicapped pupils, interviews, and the use of a variety of rating instruments to solicit adult and peer judgements concerning social behavior and tasks. A variety of research designs and analytic methods were employed, including multi-variate & multi-group ANOVAs, facto analyses, discriminant analyses, and randomized multiple probe time series analyses.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The development of social competence in children with serious behavior disorders is of critical importance to their current and future success. Although there has been a tremendous increase in social competency research over the past few years, attempts to define social competence, its requisites, and the means by which it can be taught have met with ambiguous results. Which behaviors or skills actually differentiate socially competent from incompetent children, or how those skills might be acquired, remains unclear (Neel, Meadows & Scott, 1990; Putallaz, 1983; Walker, Shinn, O'Neill & Ramsey, 1987). In part, this is due to researchers' reliance on social behavior as the indicator of success in complex social interactions. The failure to consider social task-situation-behavior interdependencies, has resulted in confusion and weak or contradictory research results. The purpose of this project was to develop empirically based taxonomies of social behavior that would provide a greater understanding of what problems face children with behavior disorders in schools.

It has been argued that, in order to develop instruments that contribute to the planning of social skills interventions for each individual child, the social tasks that present problems for a particular child need to be identified (Dodge, 1985; Dodge, McClaskey & Feldman, 1985; Neel et. al., 1990). Social tasks were first identified by Dodge (1985) as a set of stimuli (e.g., time frame, cast of persons, general situation) and the resulting end point, or goal. Expanding upon this notion, we have defined social tasks as the problems a child faces when trying to achieve a social goal in a particular situation (Neel, et. al., 1990; Meadows, 1991). Social tasks can then be conceptualized as a process by which a child attempts to achieve a desired outcome (e.g., affiliation, attention, acceptance) in a specific social context (e.g., cast of persons, time frame, general situation). The cornerstone of the social task scheme is the notion that social behavior can be conceptualized as occurring in response to specific tasks. Using this framework, social skills can be viewed as a set of or series of behaviors required for various social tasks. A socially competent person would be one who achieved his/her outcome in ways judged appropriate by others.

DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The purposes of this project were (1) to create an initial list of potentially critical social tasks and situations; (2) to identify component social skills within these tasks and situations and ; (3) to design an intervention strategy to teach skills within specific social contexts. From these purposes and based on the conceptual framework discussed above, three research objectives were developed.

Objective 1: *To identify a set of potentially critical social tasks which reliably discriminate between socially competent and incompetent children.*

The initial step in altering the outcomes of children who are behavior disordered is to identify a meaningful set of school related social tasks in order to investigate specific skills needed for children to be successful in various situations. Our first research objective, then, was to develop a set of social tasks which might be problematic for children with serious behavior disorders. In the past, researchers have used different approaches to determine specific social tasks; important social situations or contexts have sometimes been arbitrarily or intuitively determined (Freedman, Rosenthal, Donahoe, Schlundt & McFall, 1978; Gaffney & McFall, 1981; Spivack, Platt, & Shure, 1976). Different audiences and participants in social interactions, however, all have different perspectives and different opinions concerning the situations, skills, and behaviors which they believe to be most critical (Meadows, Neel, Parker & Timo, 1991). If social tasks generated were to be representative of activities in the daily lives of children for which we were programming, it was necessary for those tasks to be generated by people who interact with children and by the children themselves. Since teachers, peers, and support staff represent the population most frequently engaged in social interactions involving children in the school environment, their perceptions seemed a reasonable point of departure for our investigations.

Since a completely exhaustive list of potentially relevant tasks would probably be impossible to complete, it is important to emphasize that our purpose was to generate a list of social tasks, not to identify all social situations encountered by children and adolescents. Results from the studies conducted in this study series provided us with a list of potentially critical social tasks, the representativeness of which was assessed by asking larger groups of similar persons to rate each item in terms of perceived importance. We also established the relationship between the Social Task List and the Walker-McConnell Scale of Social

Competence and School Adjustment. A brief summary of each study related to Objective One can be found below in Section 3.0; a more detailed analysis of each study can be found in the corresponding Appendices.

Objective 2: *To develop measures that reliably identify behaviors (social skills) children use in negotiating problematic social tasks.*

Describing the social tasks that children face in school settings was only a first step. Our second objective was directed towards investigating the behaviors children use in dealing with social tasks in specific social situations. Originally, we planned to use only observational assessment measures. We expanded our assessment base to also include a traditional survey of parents, teachers and students to determine which social skills they felt were important; a modified Delphi survey to determine the social behaviors most problematic to teachers and other adults in school settings; behavioral interviews of students to generate the specific behaviors used in response to social tasks; and direct observation of students behavior. We felt it was necessary to use a variety of assessment measures in order to (1) determine if an existing list of social behaviors was valid; (2) identify the social behaviors students actually used in dealing with specific social tasks; and (3) determine if those behaviors were problematic for adults as well as peers.

Survey methodology was used in order to take a closer look at the social skills which have been targeted for intervention and to determine if the needs of students with behavior disorders have been addressed. Behavioral interviews were chosen because they are flexible in general and specific information regarding various areas of concern can be ascertained (Gresham, 1984). The interviewer can also clarify, modify, and extend the interviewee's verbal descriptions of behavior and situational variables relative to the occurrence of behavior (Linehan, 1977). We implemented a direct observations study to determine if students actually used the behaviors they reported as using in the interview. Our objective was to incorporate all three assessments to develop a measurement system which would assess students' use of specific behaviors in response to social tasks presented in the classroom.

Results from the studies designed to meet this second objective provided us with information regarding the social skills required in dealing with various problematic social tasks. These skills and behaviors then served as a basis for intervention. A brief summary of the three studies conducted for Objective Two is presented below in Section 3.0; a more complete analysis of each study is found in the corresponding Appendices.

Objective 3: *To incorporate critical social tasks, situations and behaviors in the development and evaluation of a social skills instructional package.*

Our third research objective was to incorporate the social tasks, situations and behaviors generated in previous studies in an instructional package for social skills training. The process of designing an instructional curriculum includes first deciding what to teach and how to teach it, and then determining if that teaching has any effect. We have speculated as to what to teach (social competency) and how to teach it (new behaviors within relevant situations and tasks). Instructional objectives were directed towards teaching students to successfully negotiate a set of school related tasks. The children were taught behaviors within the context of situations that were relevant to them. However, we also needed to assess the impact of what was taught. How were we to assess the efficacy of our instruction? Could we determine whether an increase in social competency has an effect on successful mainstreaming? In order to answer these evaluation questions, we found it necessary to explore the mainstream environments of students with SBD. Results from the studies implemented to meet Objective Three provided us with information about the academic and social differences between SBD students who are mainstreamed and those who remain in self-contained classes; the accommodations made for SBD students in mainstream classes; and the preliminary results about the efficacy of an intervention based upon social tasks, situations and behaviors. A brief discussion of the three studies conducted to meet Objective Three can be found below in Section 3.0; a more detailed analysis of each study can be found in the corresponding Appendices.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The project conducted a series of studies involving groups of teachers, other professionals, and children over a three year period from September 1988 to August, 1991. Since children with serious behavior disorders represent a low-density subgroup of the general population, it was necessary to extend the research to a broad geographic region in order to find sufficient numbers of appropriate subjects. Specifically, two states were involved, Washington and Colorado.

As a matter of organizational convenience, each series of studies is briefly described below under the objective to which it most directly relates. It should be noted, however, that each succeeding series of studies expands and refines the results of preceding studies. For example, while the initial list of social tasks is based upon opinion surveys, subsequent observational, interview and survey studies serve to validate (or invalidate) specific social tasks as useful in discriminating between socially competent and incompetent children. Similarly, intervention and integration studies serve to identify which specific tasks in the taxonomy prove useful as instructional targets, rather than merely good ways of discriminating between two different types of children. In that sense, all the studies described below relate to each other and in some fashion to the first objective (i.e., identifying a set of critical social tasks).

Study Series for Objective 1:
Identifying Potentially Critical Social Tasks

Study 1: Forming an Initial List of Potentially Critical Tasks

Small groups of professionals and peers participated in a Delphi survey to ascertain their consensus of opinion concerning the specific social tasks which were most likely to prove problematic for socially incompetent pupils. Subjects were: (1) special education teachers working with pupils with SBD (N=10); (2) regular education teachers who have had experience in dealing with pupils with SBD (N = 10); (3) specialists who have had contact with children with SBD (e.g., school psychologists, counselors, therapists) (N = 10); (4) researchers who have conducted studies of the social behavior of children with serious behavior disabilities (N = 10); and (5) non-handicapped peers of pupils with SBD (N = 10).

Participants were asked to list five to ten social tasks which they felt children or adolescents often face and would prove especially difficult for those who were socially incompetent. Following this initial round, lists were edited to remove duplications, transcribed into conditional statements, and returned to participants for evaluation using a standard Likert scale (1 = no problem, 5 = significant problem) to rate the perceived difficulty of the social task. Following Round 2, tasks failing to be rated as a 4 or 5 by 80% of participants in any given group were eliminated. In Round 3, the combined list was sent to all participants in all groups. Following Round 3, all tasks receiving ratings of

4 or 5 from at least 60% of the respondent were retained on the list of potentially critical social tasks.

The primary outcome of this study was a list of social tasks (34 upper elementary and 41 junior high) which are of potential importance in discriminating the socially incompetent child. (The complete lists of social tasks generated by upper elementary and junior high subjects are reported in Appendix A.) After validation with larger groups, items on each list formed the basis of a basic taxonomy of critical social tasks.

Study 2: Broad Validation of the Critical Task List

The representativeness of the Delphi survey results was assessed by asking larger groups of similar persons to rate each item in terms of perceived importance. Twenty new subjects were added to each of the original five survey groups. Participants were asked to evaluate the social tasks using a standard Likert scale (1 = no problem, 5 = significant problem) to rate the perceived difficulty of that tasks for students who were judged to be socially incompetent. All social tasks receiving ratings of 4 or 5 from at least 60% of the respondent were retained on the list.

This study produced a list of social tasks judged by at least one group of professionals to be potentially difficult for children and adolescents to negotiate successfully. After confirming the original list of social tasks with larger sample groups, 27 (out of 34) social tasks remained on the upper elementary list and 32 (out of 41) remained on the junior high list. The final versions of the upper elementary and junior high Social Task Survey (STS) are reported in Appendix B; results of this study are reported in Appendix C.

Study 3: Creating a Preliminary Critical Task Taxonomy

The purpose of this study was to create a preliminary critical social task taxonomy by classifying problematic tasks according to generally recognized conceptual categories. The social tasks identified in Studies 1 & 2 were transcribed into a uniform format and classified into categories as outlined by Dodge, McClasky and Feldman (1985). The general task categories were formulated upon the basis of their established importance in literature concerning social competency, and a thorough inspection of the items themselves. The face validity of the classifications were then evaluated by 100 graduate and undergraduate students. Given a set of cards printed with the problematic social tasks for either Upper Elementary (UE) or Junior High (JH) students, participants performed a card sort activity which involved placing each task card into one of the predetermined categories. Of the 34 UE tasks, 68% were classified with a high level of agreement, thus indicating reasonable face validity of the UE categories. However, the level of agreement was not consistent for JH categories.

The findings of this study contribute to the effort to develop assessment procedures which employ terms and concepts that are logical and meaningful, and accurately represent behavioral dimensions of potentially problematic social tasks for students with behavior disorders. Results from this study established the face validity of the Upper Elementary social task taxonomy categories. This is the essential first step in the effort to ensure discriminant and convergent validity in relation to other measures of social competence. A full analysis of results and a complete list of categories is reported in Appendix D.

Study 4: Cross-Validating the Taxonomy with Other Instruments

The purpose of this study was to validate the ability of the Social Task List (STL) to discriminate between socially competent and incompetent students and to examine the level of agreement between the newly developed STL and the Walker-McConnell Scale of Social competence (Walker & McConnell, 1988). The subject pool comprised a total of 247 students rated by 24 teachers. The student pool included the following groups:

- 49 special education students (junior high)
- 55 general education students (junior high)
- 54 special education students (upper elementary)
- 87 general education students (upper elementary)

Results indicated that, for all general education students, the level of agreement between scores on the two assessment devices was significant at the .001 level. This was true for all four subsets, as well as for the total WMC score. For the elementary aged special education students (E-SES) one significant correlation was revealed to exist between the scores on the STL and subtest one of the WMC. For the junior high aged special education students (J-SES) one significant correlation was revealed between the score on the STL and subtest one of the WMC. T-test run on the student's mean scores on the STL and on the WMC indicate that there were significant differences between the general education students and the special education students. Discriminate Analyses were conducted to investigate this question. The results of the discriminant analyses indicate that the STL is able to discriminate between the two groups (SES and GES students). In the case of the elementary aged students, the STL was able to correctly classify the students as either general or special education in 79.7% of the cases. In the case of the junior high school students, the STL was able to correctly classify the students as special or as general education in 77.9% of the cases.

This study was designed to examine the Social Task List's ability to discriminate between socially competent and socially incompetent students. Basically, this question was addressed in two ways. First, the STL was compared to an existing tool (the WMC) that has been shown to be reliable in discriminating between the two groups of students. Secondly, discriminant analyses were performed on the data collected in this study. Overall, the results of the study indicate that STL is able to discriminate between socially competent and socially incompetent students. A complete analysis and discussion of the results are reported in Appendix E.

Study Series for Objective 2
Developing Measures to Identify Social Behaviors

Study 5: A Validation of Social Skills for Students with Behavioral Disorders

The purpose of this study was to take a closer look at the social skills which have been targeted for intervention and to determine if the particular need of students with serious behavior disorders have been met. Extending the work of Williams, Walker, Holmes, Todis, and Fabre (1989) to validate the social skills included in the ACCESS program for instructing social skills, this study identified the sets of social skills valued by teachers, parents, peers and students with serious behavior disorders in various school environments. We sought to determine (1) which skills identified by the Survey of Social Skills (Williams, Et. Al., 1989) were rated as important by general education teachers, teachers of students with behavior disorders, general education students, and students with behavioral disorders; (2) if there were differences in the rank ordering of these skills in terms of importance to each group; and (3) if there were differences among the groups with regard to how they rated the specific social skills.

Teachers, students, and parents from Washington, Colorado, and Iowa (N = 383) were asked to rate the importance of 48 social skills in three domains: (1) Relating to others; (2) Relating to adults; and (3) Relating to self. A 5-point Likert scale was provided for the participants' use in rating the importance of each skill. Results indicated that, overall, teachers, students and parents viewed the skills on this survey as important social skills. Correlation coefficients indicated a moderate-to-high agreement between the parents and teachers of both special and general education students. Scores from students with behavior disorders had a low to moderate agreement with the adult groups. In addition, students with behavior disorders did not feel that skills such as Being of Assistance to the Teacher, Avoiding confrontations, and Problems with Adults, and Disagreeing with Adults in an Acceptable Way were as critical as other skills. This is a direct contradiction of the high value that general and special education teachers have placed on behaviors that demonstrate compliance and cooperation.

Participants in this study were subjected to a forced choice condition; they were provided with a pre-chosen list of skills and asked to rate their importance. A major outcome of this study was the conclusion that this limited the degree to which the data may be generalized. While it is true that this study and others like it (Timo, 1988; Williams et. al., 1989) have shown these skills to be important, they have not proven them to be critical. Having groups of people generate their own lists of skills and/or behaviors may produce different results. Further studies in this project were directed toward developing a functionally valid list of critical social behaviors and determining which of these behaviors would be critical to successful integration. (See Appendix F for a more detailed analysis of this study.)

Study 6: Determining Problematic Behaviors in Classroom Settings

The purpose of this study was two-fold: first,to determine the behaviors that teachers, administrators and support personnel thought were the most problematic for teachers in the classroom; and second to explore the purpose or goal of those behaviors. Three groups of subjects participated in a modified Delphi study. Groups consisted of special education teachers of students with behavior problems (N=20), administrators (N=19), and support personnel (e.g., counselors, school psychologists) (N=20).

Participants were sent a request to list the five to ten behaviors which they felt children or adolescents exhibited that were most problematic to teachers in classroom settings. After each behavior, they were asked to determine what they felt the child gained (social goal) from each behavior. Following the first round, lists were edited to remove duplications and returned to participants for evaluation using a standard Likert scale (1=no problem; 5=significant problem) to rate the perceived difficulty each behavior presented for teachers. Following Round 2, items failing to be rated as a 4 or 5 by 80% of respondents in any given group were eliminated. After a final editing to eliminate any duplication of items across groups, the combined list was sent to all participants in all groups. Following Round 3, all items receiving ratings of 4 or 5 from at least 60: of all respondents were retained on the list of problematic behaviors.

Results indicated that the most problematic behaviors were related to verbal and physical aggression exhibited by students toward peers and teachers. Outcomes for these behaviors included: attention, power, control, escape, affiliation, self-gratification, and revenge. A major outcome of this study was a list of behaviors considered by groups of adults to be problematic when used by children in classroom settings. This list of behaviors was then validated against those behaviors students reported during their interviews. The list of behaviors was also used in developing the observation protocol to determine if children actually exhibited these behaviors in the classroom.

Study 7: Interviewing Students to Determine Problematic Situations and Behaviors

The purpose of this study was to more closely examine the social tasks generated in previous studies and included on the Social Task List. Twenty adolescents identified as SBD and 22 typically developing peers were interviewed to determine (1) whether the social tasks were viewed as important by middle school students; (2) which social tasks were most important; (3) the characteristics of the social tasks including people; setting and activities; and (4) whether there were differences in perception between general education students and students identified as SBD. Fifteen social tasks were chosen from the STL; all were representative of social tasks students have to deal with in school settings.

Two graduate assistants interviewed the students. The students were read the social task and then asked if this was something that had happened to them at school. If they answered yes, they were asked to describe a time they had to deal with the task and give contextual details. After the first description, students were asked to describe additional situations in which they dealt with the social task. If the students stated that the task had not happened to them at school, they were asked if the task had happened to others. Interviews were videotaped and later transcribed for verbal content and coded. An example of the interview form and a list of the social tasks can be found in Appendix G.

Eleven of the social tasks were validated by 60% of the students in both groups. Four of these items were related to student-teacher interactions; five were specific to peer interaction; and two of the items were not specific as to other actors. Peer related tasks produced 194 situations; teacher related tasks elicited 130 situations involving teachers and an additional 124 that included other adults (e.g., administrators, counselors). Across all possible school locations, the classroom was most frequently reported (N = 193) as the setting; hallways were reported as the locations for 46 situations.

Overall, general and special education students validated social tasks previously agreed upon by adults as problematic social tasks in school settings, lending an increased level of confirmation to the existing data on social tasks. The eleven social tasks validated by these students appear to be important tasks relating to the social functioning of middle school students. .

Study 8: Preliminary Development of an Observation Protocol

The purpose of this study was to pilot procedures for developing an observational protocol which incorporates findings from previous phases of the project. In particular, the usefulness of empirically enumerated and validated social tasks, situations, and behaviors in the assessment process was explored. The following research question was addressed in this pilot: how can information gained from student interviews and teacher ratings be used to develop a situation-specific and contextually relevant behavior observation protocol to inform intervention programming for students with serious behavior disorders?

One of the three middle schools which had participated in the interview study was selected as the observation site (For a complete description of the school, see Appendix G). This phase of the project involved four male students from the original group of special education subjects. Two of the students selected for observation were mainstreamed into a regular eighth-grade math class. The other two students remained in the self-contained classroom for all academic instruction. All four subjects were observed in the self-contained special education classroom three times a week. In addition, the two mainstreamed students were observed in their regular math classroom three times a week.

The selection of the two target social tasks, dealing with peer provocation and dealing with teacher feedback, was based on student interview responses and teacher ratings. Because effective peer-peer and student-teacher interactions are both important to school success, one of each type of task was selected for observation. Behaviors were chosen by listing the behaviors described by all students for each of the interview items pertaining to peer provocation and teacher feedback.

Naturalistic observations of classroom interactions were conducted during 50-minute periods in each setting three times per week for six weeks during spring quarter. Recordings were made by three research assistants who were introduced as university students involved in an assignment to observe the class. Observers recorded each interaction that met the criteria for inclusion as peer provocation or teacher feedback, coding for situation and behavior. Each incident was then recorded as conflict (C) or non-conflict (N) and evaluated for outcome in terms of whether the situation was resolved (R) or not resolved (N).

Due to the limited scope and preliminary nature of the work at this stage, discussion of the process and data is limited to very general comments. Regarding the data collected in the special education classroom, rates of interaction were variable from day to day with no discernible cyclical patterns. There were no clear differences between the mainstreamed and non-mainstreamed students. In the math setting, the incidence of provocation and difficulty with feedback were nearly nonexistent even though the math teacher had reported on the checklist that both students had experienced significant problems in these areas. This illustrates the importance of gathering information from multiple sources when planning an intervention. (See Appendix H for a more detailed analysis of this study.)

Study Series for Objective 3
Incorporating Critical Social Tasks, Situations and Behaviors

Study 9: Comparative Analysis of Factors Influencing Integration

The purpose of the present study was to compare the academic and social characteristics of SBD students who remain in self-contained classrooms to those who are mainstreamed into general education settings. Subjects for this study included the 19 SBD student who participated in the interview study (Study 6). The following measurements served as a basis for comparison: (1) *Achenbach Behavior Checklists* (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983). Three versions of the Achenbach Behavior Checklists were used: the Child Behavior Checklist-Parent version, the Teacher's Report Form; and the Youth Self-Report Form.; (2) *Walker-McConnell Adolescent Scale of Social Competence and School Adjustment* (W-M) (Walker & McConnell); (3) *Social Task List* (STL) (Neel, Meadows, & Scott, 1990); and (4) *School Records*. An adapted version of the School Archival Record Search (SARS) (Walker & Severson 1991) was used to gather information from school behavioral and cumulative records.

Results indicated no significant differences between groups in areas of intelligence, achievement test scores or grade point average. Mainstreamed students were rated as significantly higher in the internalizing scale and significantly lower on the externalizing scale than non-mainstreamed SBD students. Non-mainstreamed students also scored significantly lower on the adaptive functioning scale of the Achenbach Teacher Report Form. There were no significant differences between mainstreamed and non-mainstreamed students on the total scores of the Walker-McConnell or the Youth Self Report.

Overall, we found very few differences between students with behavior disorders who are mainstreamed and those who are not. These results were somewhat surprising. They may, however, reflect a problem with measurement rather than an indication of no real differences between the groups. We have come to conclude that using standardized measures are not the answer. We need to take a closer look at the decisions teachers are making. Why are some students mainstreamed and others are not? Our data do not reliably discriminate between the mainstreamed and non-mainstreamed students. Yet, some are chosen for mainstreaming and some are not. We need to discuss with both special and general education teachers why they feel some students are ready for mainstreaming, why some are successful, and why some are not. We need to talk with students -- those who are successful in mainstream settings and those who are not. (For a more detailed analysis of the results, the reader is referred to Appendix I.)

Study 10: Adaptations/Accommodations Made for Students with SBD in Mainstream Classes

Before we are able to adequately measure the success of mildly handicapped children in mainstream settings, it is imperative that we learn more about how these students are spending their time in mainstream classes. [For a more detailed discussion concerning the philosophy underlying this study, the reader is referred to Meadows (1991), a copy of which may be found in Appendix J]. Objectives for this study included: (a) determining what accommodations are currently being made for students with behavioral disorders in general education classrooms; and (b) determining whether teachers perceive students with behavior disorders as being academically and socially successful in general education classrooms. Teachers were chosen because they were the mainstream teachers of 19 students who had been participating in an ongoing research study on social skills. The 13 teachers participating in this study represent the mainstream teachers of the 19 SBD students. Teachers were asked to complete a survey which gave direct feedback as to ways in which the teacher modified or altered curriculum, assignments, tests and/or classroom rules in order to meet the needs of students with serious behavior disorders. They were also asked to give their perceptions as to how successful these students were in their classrooms. A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix L.

The majority of teachers used the same curricula with all students and used the same criteria to evaluate all students. When asked about test modifications, 57% indicated that they did alter the way in which tests were given to students with behavior disorders. The same pattern appeared when responses to instructional accommodations were analyzed; the majority of teachers used the same instructional techniques in classes with and without students with behavior disorders. The same trend appeared when looking at behavior management techniques; 79% of teachers surveyed reported using the same behavior management techniques for all students. Only 10% of teachers reported receiving assistance for academic planning; less than half of the teachers reported receiving assistance for behavior problems. However, 26% of teachers reported that they would like to receive more assistance with behavior and/or academic planning. Teachers reported that approximately half (53%) of the students got along well with their peers; 47% were reported as not getting along well with their peers. Academically, 52% of the students were reported as making a "C" or below; teachers failed to report the academic progress of 36% of the students.

Results from this study have provided interesting, yet limited information, about some of the practices used by teachers of mainstreamed students. If we are to be successful in our efforts to mainstream students with emotional and behavior problems, our focus must be two-fold -- teaching the teacher strategies for accommodating the needs of mildly handicapped students and teaching children the academic and social behaviors necessary to be successful in mainstream settings. Results from this study have provided important first steps toward that goal. These first steps include finding out how students with behavior problems are currently spending their time in mainstream classes. Additional research is also needed in order to focus on those students who are experiencing success as well as those who are failing. Further research also needs to be directed toward determining the impact different academic, instructional and classroom management strategies have on the success of mainstreamed students. A complete report of this study may be found in Appendix K.

Study 11: A Pilot Study: Developing an Effective Instructional Intervention

The purpose of this pilot study was to develop a procedure for teaching students to successfully negotiate problematic social tasks. The important role of instruction is to link the child's social goal and a set of socially acceptable behaviors to specific social tasks and situations. (A more complete explanation of this model may be found in Neel & Cessna, in press; the reader is referred to Appendix M for a draft copy.)

Subjects included four SBD middle school students included in previous studies. Two were mainstreamed for one or more hours a day; two remained in their self-contained classroom for the entire day. Subjects were chosen according to their scores on the Social Task List indicating they had problems with the targeted tasks. Two tasks were targeted for intervention: accepting consequences of your own behavior and responding to peer provocation. Baseline data was collected by having the special education teacher use a form of event recording to record the number of situations and the number of positive and negative behaviors used during each interaction. Intervention included one week of interviews with students to determine the type of situations in which the social tasks occurred and the behaviors they used in the situations. The second phase of the intervention included direct instruction of the behaviors necessary to be successful in the given tasks and situations. A combination of modeling, role-play and rehearsal was used during direct instruction (See Appendix N). Generalization data included self-report interviews of each subject following the completion of baseline data and a daily checklist to be completed by the mainstream and special education teachers which indicated whether the task occurred and what behaviors were used.

During the second phase (direct instruction), the teachers in the state of Washington went out on strike. This included the teachers and students involved in this study. The strike lasted approximately 3 weeks and occurred in April. After the strike, there was not sufficient time to solicit more subjects -- or train more teachers.

MANAGEMENT

The organizational structure of the project was designed to allow efficient and effective management of resources, and coordination of activities across sites. In general, the Principal Investigator assumed responsibility for the overall governance of the project, with the advice of the Co-Principal Investigator and Project Consultant. Daily management of the project was the responsibility of the Project Coordinator with assistance from the Associate Project Coordinator. The Project Coordinator and Associate Project Coordinator were responsible for providing liaison with the State Site Coordinators who, in turn, provided liaison with participating school sites. Table One lists project personnel.

Table 1: Project Personnel

Principal Investigator	Richard S. Neel
Co-Principal Investigator	Owen R. White
Project Coordinator	Nancy B. Meadows
Assistant Project Coordinator	Doug Cheney
Washington Site Coordinator	Judith Burnett
Colorado Site Coordinator	Kay Cessna
Curriculum Development Specialist	Gerilyn Parker
Research Assistants	Susan Gelhar Catherine Scott
Data Collectors	Sarah Wolverton Tom O'Brien
Research Consultant	Hill Walker

DISSEMINATION

There are many researchers and practitioners working on similar problems and, if we are to develop effective interventions for students with behavior problems, it is important for each of us to share our work in various stages of development. Project staff have all contributed in various ways to communicate the results of our research to others in the field. Dissemination activities have included (1) presentations at state and national conferences in the area of special education and behavior disorders; (2) in-service teacher training workshops in Washington and Colorado (3) pre-service teacher training classes at the University of Washington, Seattle University and Seattle Pacific University; (4) articles published in professional, juried journals and (5) Master's level theses. Tables 2, 3, and 4 report dissemination activities by studies, according to their corresponding objectives.

Table 2: Objective One Dissemination Activities

Date of Data Collection	Title of Study	Method of Dissemination	Date
Fall, 1988 -- Winter, 1989	Study 1: Forming an Initial List of Potentially Critical Tasks	1a. Neel, R.S., Meadows, N. B., and Scott, C. M. (1990). Determining social tasks: A preliminary report. In (Eds.), Monograph in Behavioral Disorders (pp 38-46). Reston, VA: Council for Children with Behavior Disorders. 1b. Thirteenth Annual Conference on Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth, Tempe, AZ	November, 1990 November, 1989
Spring, 1989 -- Winter, 1990	Study 2: Broad Validation of Social Task List	2a. Council for Exceptional Children, Toronto, Canada 2b. Conference Behavior Disorders, Austin, TX	April, 1990 February, 1990
Winter, 1990 -- Spring, 1990	Study 3: Creating a Preliminary Critical Task Taxonomy	3a. Master's Thesis 3b. Conference on Behavior Disorders, Austin, TX	May, 1990 February, 1990
Winter, 1990 -- Spring, 1990	Study 4: Cross Validation of the Social Task List	4a. Washington Council for Exceptional Children, Bellingham, WA 4b. Council for Exceptional Children, Toronto, Canada	March, 1990 April, 1990

Table 3: Objective Two Dissemination Activities

Date of Data Collection	Title of Study	Method of Dissemination	Date
Winter, 1989 -- Spring, 1989	Study 5: A Validation of Social Skills	5a. Meadows, N. B., Neel, R. S., Parker, G. and Timo, K. (1991). A Validation of social skills for students with behavior disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 16 (3), 200-210. 5b. Master's Thesis 5c. Council for Exceptional Children, San Francisco, CA	May, 1991 January, 1990 April, 1989
Winter, 1989 -- Spring 1989	Study 6: Determining Problematic Social Behaviors	6a. Neel, R. S. and Cessna, K. K. (1990). Maybe this behavior does make sense. In R. B. Rutherford and S. A. DiGangi (Eds.), Monograph in Behavioral Disorders (pp 18-22). Reston, VA: Council for Children with Behavior Disorders. 6b. Washington Council for Exceptional Children, Bellingham, WA 6c. Inservice, Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, WA	November, 1990 March, 1990 August, 1989
Fall, 1990 -- Winter, 1991	Study 7: Interviewing Students to Determine Problematic Situations and Behaviors	7a. Washington Council for Exceptional Children, Spokane, WA 7b. Colloquium, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, TX 7c. The Oregon Conference, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 7d. Article in preparation	April, 1991 March, 1991 February, 1991
Spring, 1991	Study 8: Preliminary Development of an Observation Protocol	8a. Summer Workshop: Teaching Students with Behavior Problems, The University of Washington, Seattle, WA 8b. Article in preparation	July, 1991

Table 4: Objective Three Dissemination Activities

Date of Data Collection	Title of Study	Method of Dissemination	Date
Fall, 1990 -- Spring, 1991	Study 9: Comparative Analysis of Factors Influencing Integration	9a. Fourteenth Annual conference on Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth, Tempe, AZ 9b. National Adolescent Conference, Miami, FL 9c. Article in preparation	November, 1990 October, 1990
Winter, 1991	Study 10: Adaptations / Accommodations Made for SBD Students in Mainstream Classes	10a. Colloquium Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, TX 10b. Meadows, N. B. (in press). Social Competence Mainstreaming and Students with Serious Behavior Disorders. Monograph in Behavioral Disorders. 10c. Article in preparation	March, 1991
Winter, 1991 -- Spring, 1991	Study 11: Developing an Effective Instructional Intervention: A Pilot Study	11a. Neel, R. S. and Cessna, K. K. (in press). Replacement behaviors: A strategy for teaching social skills to children with behavior problems. Rural Special Education Quarterly. 11b. Article in preparation	

References

Achenbach, T. M. & Edelbrock, C. (1983). Manual for the Child Behavior checklist and Revised Child Behavior Profile. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont.

Ager, C. L. & Cole, C. L. (1991). A review of cognitive-behavioral interventions for children and adolescents with behavioral disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 16(4), 276-287.

Asher, S. R. (1983). Social competence and peer status: Recent advances and future directions. Child Development, 54, 1427-1434.

Asher, S. R., & Hymel, Sl (1981). Children's social competence in peer relations: Sociometric and behavioral assessment. In K. Dodge (Ed.), Social competence in children (pp. 125-157).

Coie, J. D. & Kepttl, G. K. (1990). Adapting intervention to the problems of aggressive and disruptive rejected children. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.) Peer rejection in Childhood. (pp. 309-337) New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coie, J. D., & Kupersmidt, J. B. (1983). A behavioral analysis of emerging social status in boys' groups. Child Development, 54, 1400-1416.

Coie, J. D., Dodge, G., & Coppotelli, H. (1982). Dimensions and types of social status; A corss-age perspective. Developmental Psychology, 18(4), 557-570.

Dodge, K. (1986). A social information processing model of social competence in children. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), Minnesota Symposium in Child Psycholog, (Vol. 8, pp. 77-125). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dodge, K. A. (1983). Behavioral antecendents of peer social status. Child Development, 54, 1386-1399.

Dodge, K. A. (1985). Facets of social interaction and the assessment of social competence in children. In B. H. Schneider, K. H. Rubin, & J. E. Ledingham (Eds.) Children's Peer Relations: Issues in Assessment and Intervention. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Dodge, K., McClaskey, C.L., & Feldman, E. (1985). Situational approach to the assessment of social competence in children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53(3), 344-353.

Freedman, B. J., Rosenthal, L., Donahoe, D. P., Jr., Schlundt, D. G., & McFall, R. M. (1978). A social-behavioral analysis of skills deficits in delinquent and nondelinquent adolescent boys. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 1448-1462.

Gable, R. A., Hendrickson, J. M. &Rutherford, R. B. (1991). Strategies for integrating students with behavioral disorders into general education. Monograph in Behavioral Disorders: Sever Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth (Vol. 14), Reston VA: Council for Exceptional Children

Gaffney, L. R., & McFall, R. M. (1981). A comparison of social skills in delinquent and nondelinquent adolescent girls using a behavioral role-playing inventory. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 959-967.

Goldstein, A. P., Sprafkin, R. P., Gershaw, N. J. & Klien, P. (1980). Skillstreaming the adolescent. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Gresham, F. (1986). Conceptual issues in th assessment of social competence in children. In P. Strain, M. Guralnick, & H. Walker (Eds.), Children's social behavior: Development, assessment and modification, New York:: Academic Press.

Gresham, F. M. & Elliott, S. N. (1988). Teacher's social validity ratings of social skills: Comparisons between mildly handicapped and nonhandicapped children. Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 6, 225-234.

Gresham, F. M. (1981). Social skills training with handicapped children: A review. Review of Educational Research, 51(1), 139-176.

Gresham, F. M. (1983). Social validity in the assessment of children's social skills: Establishing standards for social competency. Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 1, 297-307.

Krasnor, L. R. & Rubin, K. H. (1983). Preschool social problem solving: Attempts and outcomes in naturalistic interaction. Child Development, 54, 1545 - 1558.

Kupersmidt, J. B., Patterson, C. J., & Griesler, P. C. (1988). Peer relations of children in special education. Paper presented at the NATO Advanced Study Institute On Social Competence in Developmental Perspective, Les Arcs, France.

Ladd, S. (1985). In B. H. Schneider, K. H. Rubin, & J. E. Ledingham (Eds.), Children's peer relations: Issues in assessment and intervention. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Lloyd, J., Kaufman, J. & Kupersmidt, J. (1988). Success of students with behavior disorders in general education environments: A review of research and a systematic model for development of interventions. In K. Gadow and I. Bialer (Eds.), Advances in Learning and Behavioral Disabilities, 8, (Greenwich, CN: JAI Press.)

Meadows, N. B. (1991). Social competency, mainstreaming and children with behavior disorders. Monograph in Behavioral Disorders (Vol 14, pp 61-66), Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

McFall, R. M. (1982). A review and reformulation of the concept of social skills. Behavioral Assessment, 4, 1 - 35.

Meadows, N. B., Neel, R. S. , Parker, G. M. & Timo, K. (1991). A validation of social skills with behavior disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 16(3), 200-210.

Meadows, N. B., Neel, R. S., Scott, C.M., & Parker, G. M. (1991). A preliminary report: Mainstreaming students with behavior disorders. Seattle, WA: Washington Institute for the Study of Social Behaviors.

Neel, R. & Cessna, K. (in press). Behavioral intent: Instructional content for children with behavior disorders. In K. Cessna & R. S. Neel (Eds.), Monograph: Instructionally differentiated programming: A needs-based approach for students with behavior disorders. Colorado Department of education , Denver, CO.

Neel, R. S., & Cessna, K. K. (1990). Maybe this behavior does make sense. In R. B. Rutherford, Jr. & S. A. DiGangi (Eds.), Severe behavior disorders of children and youth (Vol. 13, pp. 18-22). Reston, VA: Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.

Neel, R. S., Jenkins, Z. N., & Meadows, N. B. (1990). Social problem-solving behaviors and aggression in young children: A descriptive observational study. Behavioral Disorders, 16(1), 39-51.

Neel, R. S., Meadows, N. B., & Scott, C. M. (1990). Determining social tasks: A preliminary report. Monograph in Behavioral Disorders: Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth (Vol. 13).Reston, VA: Council for Children With Behavior Disorders.

Neel, R. S., Meadows, N. B., Levine, P. & Edgar, E. G. (1988). What happens after special education: A statewide follow-up study of secondary students who have behavioral disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 13(3), 209-216.

Pelligrini, D. S., & Urbain, E. S. (1985). An evaluation of interpersonal cognitive problem solving training with children. Journal of Child Psychiatry, 26(1), 17-41.

Putallaz, M. (1983). Predicting children's sociometric status from their behavior. Child Development, 54, 1417-1426.

Putallaz, M., & Gottman, J. M. (1981). An interactional model of children's entry into peer groups. Child Development, 52, 986-994.

Robins, L. (1966). Deviant children grown up. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.

Robins, L. (1978). Sturdy predictors of adult outcomes: Replications from longitudinal studies. Psychological Medicine, 1978, 8, 611-622.

Rubin, K. H. & Krasnor, L. (1986). Social-cognitive and social behavioral perspectives on problem-solving. In M. Perimutter (Ed.), Minnesota symposium in child psychology, (Vol. 8, pp. 1-68). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sabornie, E. J., & Kauffman, J. M. (1985). Regular classroom sociometric status of behaviorally disordered adolescents. Behavioral Disorders, 10, 268-274.

Schloss, P. J., Schloss C. N., Wood, C. E., & Kiehl, W. S. (1986). A critical review of social skills research with behaviorally disordered students. Behavioral Disorders, 12 (1), 1-14.

Semmel, M. I., Gottlieb, J., & Robinson, N. M. (1979). Mainstreaming: Perspectives on educating handicapped children in the public school. In D. C. Berliner (Ed.), Review of Research in Education (Vol. VII). Washington D. C.: American Educational Research Association.

Spivack, G., Platt, J., & Shure, M. 91976). The problem-solving approach to adjustment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stokes, T. & Baer, D. (1977). An implicit technology of generalization. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 10, 349-367.

Truesdell, L. A. (1988). Mainstreaming in an urban middle school: Effects of school organization and climate. The Urban Review, 20(1), 42-58.

Truesdell, L. A. (1990). Behavior and achievement of mainstreamed junior high special class students. The Journal of Special Education, 24(2), 234-245.

Walker, H. M. & Severson, H. (1991). School Archival Records Search (SARS). Longmont, CO: Sopris West, Inc.

Walker, H. M. (1984). Teacher social behavior standards and expectations as determinants of classroom ecology, teacher behavior, and child outcomes (National Institute of Education paper). Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Walker, H. M., & Rankin, R. (1983). Assessing the behavioral expectations and demands of less restrictive settings. School Psychology Review, 12, 274-284.

Walker, H. M., Shinn, M. R., O'Neill, R. E., & Ramsey, E. (1987). A longitudinal assessment of the development of antisocial behavior in boys: Rationale, methodology, and first-year results. Remedial and Special Education, 8(4), 7-16.

Walker, H.M. & McConnell, S. R. (1988) The Walker-McConnell Scale of Social Competence and School Adjustment. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Williams, S. L., Walker, H. M., Holmes, D., Todis, B., & Fabre, T. R. (1989). Social validation of adolescent social skills by teachers and students. Remedial and Special Education, *10*(4), 18-27.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., Wotruba, J. W., & Nania P. A. (1990). Instructional arrangements: Perceptions from general education. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22(4), 4-8.

Zaragoza, N., Vaughn, S., & McIntosh, R. (1991). Social skills interventions and children with behavior problems: A review. Behavioral Disorders, 16(4), 260-275.

APPENDIX A

DETERMINING SOCIAL TASKS: A PRELIMINARY REPORT

Determining Social Tasks: A Preliminary Report

Richard S. Neel and Nancy Meadows

The goal of any educational program is to prepare students to live successful lives during their school years and following graduation. As basic social competency is generally considered essential for that success, for schools to make a meaningful impact on the lives of children with serious behavioral disorders, programs will need to be developed that improve their social competency.

There has been an increase in social competency research over the past few years with a majority of that research being conducted in the area of assessment. Studies have focused on identifying socially competent and incompetent children primarily on the basis of adult and peer judgments (Asher & Hymel, 1981; Dodge, 1985; Dodge, Mcclaskey, & Feldman, 1985; Gresham, 1986). Numerous assessment devices such as peer sociometric interviews, nomination and rating scales, teacher rating instruments, and parent rating scales have been developed. Putallaz and Gottman (1981) labeled such judgments as *indicator variables* because they might indicate the existence of a problem, but not to explain the *nature* of the problem. Which behaviors or skills actually differentiate socially competent from incompetent children, or how those skills might be acquired, remains unclear (Putallaz, 1983; Walker, Shinn, O Neill, & Ramsey, 1987). Additionally, the assumptions underlying the practice of focusing simply on social behavior as the indicator of complex social interactions have been questioned (Neel & Cessna, 1990).

Dodge and his colleagues have argued that in order to develop instruments that contribute to the planning of social skills interventions for each individual child, the social tasks that present problems for a particular child need to be identified (Dodge, 1985; Dodge et al., 1985). Social tasks were first defined by Dodge (1985) as a set of stimuli (e.g., time frame, cast of persons, general situation) and the resulting end point, or goal. Expanding upon his notions, the present authors have defined social tasks as the problem a child faces when trying to achieve a social goal in a particular situation. Social tasks can then be conceptualized as a process by which a child attempts to achieve a desired outcome (e.g., affiliation, attention, acceptance) in a specific social context (e.g., cast of persons, time frame, general situation). Using this framework, social skills can be viewed as a set of, or series of, behaviors required for various social tasks. A socially competent person would be one who achieved his/her desired outcome in ways judged appropriate by others. The cornerstone of the social task scheme is the notion that social behavior can be conceptualized as occurring in response to specific tasks (Dodge, 1985).

The purpose of this study was to create an initial list of social tasks that would be problematic for children with behavior problems. In the past, researchers have used different approaches to determine these specific social tasks. Important social or situational contexts have sometimes been arbitrarily or intuitively determined (Freedman, Rosenthal, Donahoe, Schlundt, & McFall, 1978; Gaffney & McFall, 1981; Spivack, Platt, & Shure, 1976). Children are then trained in component process skills such as problem solving. Realizing that such an approach does not recognize the importance of specific tasks in assessing social behavior, Dodge et al. (1985) asked 50 elementary school teachers to identify frequently occurring social situations they thought were likely to cause problems for children in grades 2 to 4. They then developed a taxonomy of 44 social tasks in which a child's response to a specific task may be assessed as either competent or incompetent.

The study described here is the first in a series that was designed to create an initial list of potentially critical social tasks, to identify component social skills within these tasks, and to design an intervention to teach skills within specific social contexts. It is important to emphasize that the authors' purpose was to generate *a* list of social tasks, not to identify all social situations encountered by children and adolescents. This purpose was similar to that of Dodge et al. (1985) who identified a set of common and important social tasks children face. There are, however, several major differences in the present approach.

First, the approach of this current study expanded the pool of persons to nominate possible problematic social tasks to include general and special education teachers, specialists (school counselors, school psychologists), and peers, as well as experts. Typically, social skills are generated by experts and researchers in the field of social competency and then validated by teachers or other significant adults (parents, psychologists, counselors) using a forced-choice format. Previous research has shown, however, that opinions differ as to what social skills are critical for success (Meadows, Neel, Parker, & Timo, 1989; Williams, Walker, Holmes, Todis, & Fabre, 1989). If social tasks generated were to be representative of activities in the daily lives of the children for which the authors were programing, it was necessary for these tasks to be generated by those people who interact with these children and by the children themselves. An exhaustive list of potentially relevant tasks would be difficult to compile. However, since teachers, peers, and support staff represent the population most frequently engaged in social interactions involving children in the school environment, their perceptions seemed a reasonable point of departure for these investigations.

Second, the authors utilized a Delphi survey technique designed to enable the groups to reach consensus on which social tasks were important. Unlike common survey techniques which only ask participants to express opinions on one occasion, the Delphi method begins by asking participants to list those items which they feel are most important and uses several rounds of evaluation to reach consensus on the items selected. This repeated consideration of each item increases the likelihood that a set of critical social tasks would be identified in the initial list of tasks.

Finally, the target population of this present study extended to older populations of children. Participants were asked to consider problematic social tasks for students in grades 4 through 9.

METHODS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Subjects

Ten groups of 10 individuals each were formed; five of these groups were comprised of 50 individuals representing upper elementary children (grades 4, and 6) and the other five groups consisted of 50 individuals drawn from populations associated with junior high students (grades 7, 8, and 9). The groups are as follows: (a) special education teachers working with behaviorally and learning disabled students; (b) general education teachers; (c) specialists (e.g., school psychologists, counselors, therapists); (d) nonhandicapped peers of mildly handicapped students; and (e) researchers who have conducted studies of the social behavior of mildly handicapped students.

Teachers and specialists with a minimum of 3 years of experience working with children with behavioral disorders were asked to participate by administrators in Washington and Colorado schools. Experts were consulting editors of *Behavioral Disorders* and were recruited based on their published work concerning the social behavior of children with behavioral disorders. Typically, developing, socially competent peers were nominated by their general education teachers. All subjects in this study were volunteers.

Procedures

Following subject selection and the attainment of informed subject consent, adult subjects were sent a request to list five to ten social tasks which they felt children or adolescents often face and would prove especially difficult for those who were socially incompetent. Peers were given the same instructions, but were interviewed by a member of the project staff to solicit their opinions.

Following Round 1, lists were edited to remove duplications, transcribed into conditional statements ("when a child is. . ."), and returned to participants for evaluation using a standard Likert scale (1 = no problem, 5 = significant problem) to rate the perceived level of difficulty of that situation. At this point in the study, participants rate only those items generated by members in their own groups.

Following Round 2, items failing to be rated as a 4 or 5 by 80% of respondents in any given group were eliminated. After a final editing to eliminate any duplication of items across groups, the combined list was sent to all participants in all groups. The instructions and scales for Round 3 were similar to those used in Round 2, with the additional information that the list of items had been increased to include tasks identified by other groups. Following Round 3, all items receiving ratings of 4 or 5 from at least 60% of the respondents were retained on the list of potentially critical social tasks.

RESULTS

Upper Elementary

In Round 1, upper elementary participants generated a total of 317 social tasks. Following Round 2, 81 items were rated as a 4 or 5 by 80% or more of the subjects in each group. After eliminating duplications, 49 items were included in the Round 3 survey. Following Round 3, 34 social tasks received ratings of 4 or 5 from 60% or more of the respondents.

Table 1 reports the 34 social tasks, the group(s) that originally generated that item, and the percentage of agreement above 4 or 5. No items remained that were generated solely by peers; however, 3 items that were generated by students as well as by other groups were retained. Of the 34 items, only 8 reached an agreement of 80% or above.

TABLE 1

Round 3 Results – Upper Elementary

Conditional Statement	Generated By	Percentage Agreement
When a child hits or pushes classmates	SET, SPC, RET	89.8
When a child is made fun of by classmates	SPC	87.7
When a child responds to failure or rejection by losing self control	SPC, RES	87.5
When a child is faced with pressure from classmates to use drugs or alcohol	EXP	83.7
When a child must deal with failure	RET	83.7
When a child must deal with being embarrassed or accused	SET	83.7
When a child gets mad when disagreeing	SET	83.7
When a child has a temper tantrum	SPC, RET	83.7
When a child has been accepted by a group and then rejected	RET	79.6
When a child is picked on by a classmate	EXP, SPC	77.6
When a child overreacts before thinking a situation through	SET, SPC	77.6
When a child doesn't consider the feelings of others	SPC	77.5
When a child is excluded from "the group"	SPC, RET	75.6
When a child won't compromise with classmates	SPC	75.5
When a child has differing perceptions about fairness and rules	EXP	75.5
When a child is physically hurt by a classmate	SET	75.5
When a child's best friend chooses to spend time with another person	EXP	75.5
When a child has a problem following the rules	RET	73.5
When a child is upset because a classmate has taken something	SET	73.5
When a child is called names	SET, SPC, RET	73.5
When a child is encouraged to misbehave	EXP	73.5
When a child steals from a classmate	SET, RET	73.4
When a child makes fun of classmates	SET, SPC	71.5
When a child doesn't accept "no" as an answer	SET, RES	71.4
When a child's poor work is presented in front of classmates	EXP	71.4
When a child competes to earn attention from an adult	EXP	69.4
When a child talks to a classmate and is rejected	EXP, SPC	69.4
When a child picks on classmates	SET, RES	69.4
When a child is trying to settle a conflict with a classmate	SET	67.4
When a child has a disagreement with classmates	SPC	67.4
When a child is rejected by classmates for trying to control an activity	EXP	65.3
When a child blames others	SET	63.3
When a child gets in trouble riding the bus	SPC	63.2
When a child takes part in a loosely supervised activity	EXP, SET	61.2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Junior High

In Round 1, junior high participants generated a total of 370 items. Following Round 2, 116 items were rated as a 4 or 5 by 80% or more of the subjects in each group. After eliminating duplications, 72 items were included in the Round 3 survey. Following Round 3, 41 social tasks received ratings of 4 or 5 from 60% or more of the respondents.

Table 2 lists the 41 social tasks remaining after Round 3, the group(s) that originally generated the item, and the percentage of agreement above 4 or 5. Items were evenly distributed across all groups with special education teachers contributing the most items (16). Three items that were generated solely by students were retained.

TABLE 2

Round 3 Results – Junior High

Conditional Statement	Generated By	Percentage Agreement
When a student's temper is not controlled	RET	92.3
When a student is ridiculed by a teacher or a classmate	EXP, SPC	86.3
When a student is offered drugs or alcohol	EXP, SPC	84.6
When a student responds to a frustrating situation immaturely (temper tantrum, whining, verbal abuse)	SET	83.7
When a student uses any or all behaviors to receive attention	SET, SPC	82.7
When a student is put down in front of classmates	SET	82.7
When a student is rejected by classmates	SET, SPC, RET, RES	82.4
When a student has difficulty in school because of substance abuse	RET	80.7
When a student is responsible for negative or disruptive behavior in the classroom	SET, RET	80.7
When a student is hit by someone	EXP	78.9
When a student gets angry	EXP, SPC	78.9
When a student has to deal with bullies or abusive behavior	EXP, SET, RET, RES	77.0
When a student's feeling are hurt	EXP	77.0
When a student's trust has been betrayed	RES	76.9
When a student has a possession destroyed	EXP	76.9
When a student constantly criticizes classmates	SPC	76.9
When a student is provoked to fight by a classmate	EXP, SPC	75.0
When a student doesn't accept and/or cope with consequences of own behavior	SET	75.0
When a student feels insecure with or is unwelcomed by classmates	EXP, RES	74.5
When a student must deal with parents' divorce	RES	73.1
When a student is blamed for something he/she didn't do	EXP	73.1
When a student feels discriminated against for being a minority	RET	73.0
When a student doesn't respect classmates' "personal space"	SET	72.6
When a student has poor personal hygene	SET	70.6
When a student carreis anger from an earlier confrontation to other situations	SET	69.3
When a student "picks on" a classmate	SET	69.2
When a student doesn't fit in with classmates	SPC	68.6
When a student can't identify and verbalize feelings	RET	68.0
When a student makes inappropriate sexual comments	EXP	68.0
When a student is expected to act tough towards other kids	RES	67.6
When a student is teased by a classmate	EXP, SET, SPC, RET	67.3
When a student is criticized	RET, RES	67.3
When a student doesn't see the reward for good social skills	SPC	66.0
When a student feels powerless	SET	66.0
When a student is in a crowded unstructured environment	SET	65.4
When a student is pressured by classmates to get into trouble	RES	65.4
When a student acts immaturely with classmates	SET	63.5
When a student doesn't know how to ask for help	RET	63.4
When a student has trouble staying on task	SET	61.5
When a student is the subject of rumors	SET, RET, RES	60.8
When a student is faced with standing up for his/her rights	SET	60.8

DISCUSSION

This is a preliminary report on the development of a taxonomy of critical social tasks that present problems for socially incompetent children. There are many researchers and practitioners working on similar problems, and if we are to develop effective curricula, it is important for each of us to share our work in various stages of development. The purpose of this report is to communicate a list of potentially critical social tasks created by a number of children, teachers, specialists, and experts and to discuss these findings in terms of the broader theoretical development of social competency curricula.

The social tasks generated in this study represent situations that may be potentially difficult for children and adolescents to negotiate successfully. Previous research has shown that children will be judged socially competent by their teachers, parents, and peers if they can interact in ways that are viewed as competent in a variety of situations (Coie, Dodge, & Coppotelli, 1982; Coie & Kupersmidt, 1983; Dodge, 1983; Neel, Jenkins, & Meadows, in press; Putallaz, 1983; Putallaz & Gottman, 1981). Being able to successfully negotiate a set of school-related tasks enables students to profit from the educational experience as well as to develop and maintain social relationships. The list presented here does not represent the universe of social tasks; rather, it represents a set or subset of situations that may predict social competency in school settings.

Generally, the groups participating in this study generated different types of social tasks. Teachers generated more classroom-oriented tasks, students generated more peer-related tasks, and specialists generated more tasks concerning outside influences (e.g., drug and alcohol abuse). This parallels the listing of specific skills reported by other researchers (Meadows et al., 1989; Williams et al., 1989). Future research will need to determine whether or not acceptable performance in one or more of these situations will predict judgments of social competency.

In another finding, the tasks rated as important by children were not the same as the tasks rated as important by adults. Students and adults had different perceptions regarding what constituted an important social task, and few tasks generated by the children remained throughout the rounds of the Delphi. It has been argued that peer judgments are the major determiners of social rejection and acceptance (Asher, 1983; Asher & Hymel, 1981), yet few peer-generated items gained acceptance throughout all groups. There may be several explanations for this.

First, four times as many adults as children participated in this study. This may have overrepresented the values of the adults. Past research has shown that there are differences between what adults and children view as critical social skills (Meadows et al., 1990; Williams et al., 1989). Therefore, it is not surprising that when asked about social tasks, similar results occurred. If the tasks generated by children were viewed as trivial, or at least less important, than those generated by adults, this would have important implications for future curriculum development.

Another possible conclusion is that peers and adults are focusing on two different concepts for social tasks. Peers in this study generated different, more specific social tasks than did the adults. Adults may be focusing on those tasks that will lead to successful future adult adjustment, whereas peers may be focusing on current acceptance. It may be true also that within each of these social task constructs, there are two different sets of social skills. One set includes those skills children need to exhibit for adult approval, as reflected in rating scales. These skills may include what Walker (1984) and others have called adjustment skills and peer interaction skills that are viewed as important by teachers and parents. There may also be another set of social skills that predicts peer acceptance similar to those assessed by sociometric measures (Asher, 1983; Asher & Hymel, 1981). What might be emerging in this literature is a two by two matrix of current versus future acceptance on one axis, and adult versus peer required social skills on the other. More work in understanding the perspective of social competence taken by the various groups in determining social judgments, social tasks, and critical social skills needs to be conducted.

Social competency is a complex problem that presents several serious hurdles for researchers and educators. As more is learned about what predicts competent children and adults, the problems of perspective, social task, and the relationships between perceptions, tasks, skills, and judgments become more heightened. This study has reported the preliminary findings regarding a set of social tasks that are viewed by children and adults as being critical in the social process. Further work is needed to fit these findings into a comprehensive framework of social competence. A crucial next step is a more careful evaluation of social tasks viewed as critical by children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

Asher, S. R. (1983). Social competence and peer status: Recent advances and future directions. *Child Development, 54*, 1427-1434.

Asher, S. R., & Hymel, S. (1981). Children's social competence in peer relations: Sociometric and behavioral assessment. In K. Dodge (Ed.), *Social competence in children* (pp. 125-157). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coie, J. D., Dodge, G., & Coppotelli, H. (1982). Dimensions and types of social status: A cross-age perspective. *Developmental Psychology, 18*(4), 557-570.

Coie, J. D., & Kupersmidt, J. B. (1983). A behavioral analysis of emerging social status in boys' groups. *Child Development, 54*, 1400-1416.

Dodge, K. A. (1983). Behavioral antecedents of peer social status. *Child Development, 54*, 1386-1399.

Dodge, K. A. (1985). Facets of social interaction and the assessment of social competence in children. In B. H. Schneider, K. H. Rubin, & J. E. Ledingham (Eds.), *Children's peer relations: Issues in assessment and intervention* (pp. 3-22). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Dodge, K. A., McClaskey, C. L., & Feldman, E. (1985). Situational approach to the assessment of social competence in children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53*, 344-353.

Freedman, B. J., Rosenthal, L., Donahoe, C. P., Jr., Schlundt, D. G., & McFall, R. M. (1978). A social-behavioral analysis of skills deficits in delinquent and nondelinquent adolescent boys. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46*, 1448-1462.

Gaffney, L. R., & McFall, R. M. (1981). A comparison of social skills in delinquent and nondelinquent adolescent girls using a behavioral role-playing inventory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49*, 959-967.

Gresham, F. M. (1986). Conceptual issues in the assessment of social competence in children. In P. S. Strain, M. J. Guralnick, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), *Children's social behavior: Development, assessment, and modification* (pp. 143-179). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Meadows, N. B., Neel, R. S., Parker, G. M., & Timo, K. (in press). A validation of social skills for students with behavior disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*.

Neel, R. S., & Cessna, K. K. (1990). Maybe this behavior does make sense. In R. B. Rutherford, Jr. & S. A. DiGangi (Eds.), *Severe behavior disorders of children and youth* (Vol. 13, pp. 18-22). Reston, VA: Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.

Neel, R. S., Jenkins, Z. N., & Meadows, N. B. (in press). Social problem-solving behaviors and aggression in young children: A naturalistic observational study. *Behavioral Disorders*.

Putallaz, M. (1983). Predicting children's sociometric status from their behavior. *Child Development, 54*, 1417-1426.

Putallaz, M., & Gottman, J. M. (1981). An interactional model of children's entry into peer groups. *Child Development, 52*, 986-994.

Spivack, G., Platt, J., & Shure, M. (1976). *The problem-solving approach to adjustment.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Walker, H. M. (1984). *Teacher social behavior standards and expectations as determinants of classroom ecology, teacher behavior, and child outcomes* (National Institute of Education paper). Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Walker, H. M., Shinn, M. R., O'Neill, R. E., & Ramsey, E. (1987). A longitudinal assessment of the development of antisocial behavior in boys: Rationale, methodology, and first-year results. *Remedial and Special Education, 8*(4), 7-16.

Williams, S. L., Walker, H. M., Holmes, D., Todis, B., & Fabre, T. R. (1989). Social validation of adolescent social skills by teachers and students. *Remedial and Special Education, 10*(4), 18-27.

Richard S. Neel, Professor of Special Education and Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, 206 Miller Hall, DQ-12, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195

Nancy B. Meadows, Project Coordinator, Department of Special Education, 103 Miller Hall, DQ-12, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195

41

42

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

SOCIAL TASK LIST

UPPER ELEMENTARY: 4TH -- 6TH GRADE
JUNIOR HIGH: 7TH -- 9TH GRADE

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98195

*Washington Institute for the
Study of Social Behaviors
103 Miller Hall, DQ-12
(206) 543-1827
FAX: (206) 543-8439*

SOCIAL TASK LIST
4TH -- 6TH GRADE

WASHINGTON INSTITUTE FOR THE
STUDY OF SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

I. Student Information

Student Identification Number:_______________

Student Gender:_____________ Teacher's Name:_____________________________

Student Age:________________ Grade ___ School:___________________________

Classroom Type: ( )Regular ( )Resource ( )Self-contained

Date Administered:_____________

II. Directions

Each of the numbered statements in this survey describes a situation that an upper elementary student might face. We are interested in your evaluation of how well your student copes with these situations. The procedure requires two steps: after reading the statement describing a typical social situation, decide whether or not you have observed the student you are evaluating in that particular situation. If you have never observed the student in that situation, put a check in the space directly left of the number of the statement (the column labeled NA) and move on to the next statement. If you have observed the student in the situation described, circle the number (from 1 to 5) that you feel best represents how well that student copes with that situation. The scale is designed so that the number "1" describes a student who has no difficulty ("no problem") coping with the situation; the number "5" describes a student who has significant difficulty ("significant problem"). The numbers in between (2-4) represent, of course, degrees of difficulty between these two extremes.

Please consider each statement carefully and choose only one answer for each item. Also, be sure to keep only the student being evaluated in mind as you fill out the survey. And finally, please do not mark between the numbers on the rating scale--circle the one number that best approximates the level of difficulty the student has with the situation.

Thank you for participating.

NA		No Problem				Significant Problem
__1.	When a child has differing perceptions about fairness and rules.	1	2	3	4	5
__2.	When a child responds to failure or rejection by losing self-control.	1	2	3	4	5
__3.	When a child doesn't accept "no" as an answer.	1	2	3	4	5
__4.	When a child does not consider the feelings of others.	1	2	3	4	5
__5.	When a child is called names.	1	2	3	4	5
__6.	When a child overreacts before thinking a situation through.	1	2	3	4	5
__7.	When a child is excluded from "the group."	1	2	3	4	5
__8.	When a child has been accepted by a group and then rejected.	1	2	3	4	5
__9.	When a child must deal with failure.	1	2	3	4	5
__10.	When a child won't compromise with classmates.	1	2	3	4	5
__11.	When a child blames others.	1	2	3	4	5
__12.	When a child must deal with being embarrassed or accused.	1	2	3	4	5
__13.	When a child is hurt by a classmate, physically.	1	2	3	4	5
__14.	When a child picks on classmates.	1	2	3	4	5
__15.	When a child's poor work is presented in front of classmates.	1	2	3	4	5
__16.	When a child is encouraged to misbehave.	1	2	3	4	5
__17.	When a child has a temper tantrum.	1	2	3	4	5

Copyright c 1989 by Richard S. Neel

NA		No Problem				Significant Problem
__18.	When a child hits or pushes classmates.	1	2	3	4	5
__19.	When a child has a problem following the rules.	1	2	3	4	5
__20.	When a child is faced with pressure from classmates to use drugs or alcohol.	1	2	3	4	5
__21.	When a child makes fun of classmates.	1	2	3	4	5
__22.	When a child is upset because a classmate has taken something.	1	2	3	4	5
__23.	When a child talks to a classmate and is rejected.	1	2	3	4	5
__24.	When a child is made fun of by classmates.	1	2	3	4	5
__25.	When a child is picked on by a classmate.	1	2	3	4	5
__26.	When a child gets mad when disagreeing.	1	2	3	4	5
__27.	When a child steals from a classmate.	1	2	3	4	5

Vrsnedit.Doc.j
Broad Validation Disk #1

Copyright c 1989 by Richard S. Neel

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98195

Washington Institute for the
Study of Social Behaviors
103 Miller Hall, DQ-12
(206) 543-1827
FAX: (206) 543-8439

SOCIAL TASK LIST
7TH -- 9TH GRADE

WASHINGTON INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

I. Student Information

Student Identification Number:_______________

Student Gender:_____________ Teacher's Name:_____________________________

Student Age:________________ Grade ___ School:____________________________

Classroom Type: ( )Regular ( )Resource ( )Self-contained

Date Administered:_____________

II. Directions

Each of the numbered statements in this survey describes a situation that an adolescent might face. We are interested in your evaluation of how well your student copes with these situations. The procedure requires two steps: after reading the statement describing a typical social situation, decide whether or not you have observed the student you are evaluating in that particular situation. If you have never observed the student in that situation, put a check in the space directly left of the number of the statement (the column labeled NA) and move on to the next statement. If you have observed the student in the situation described, circle the number (from 1 to 5) that you feel best represents how well that student copes with that situation. The scale is designed so that the number "1" describes a student who has no difficulty ("no problem") coping with the situation; the number "5" describes a student who has significant difficulty ("significant problem"). The numbers in between (2-4) represent, of course, degrees of difficulty between these two extremes.

Please consider each statement carefully and choose only one answer for each item. Also, be sure to keep only the student being evaluated in mind as you fill out the survey. And finally, please do not mark between the numbers on the rating scale--circle the one number that best approximates the level of difficulty the student has with the situation.

Thank you for participating.

NA		No Problem				Significant Problem
__1.	When the student is put down in front of classmates.	1	2	3	4	5
__2.	When the student doesn't accept and cope with consequences of own behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
__3.	When the student can't identify and verbalize feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
__4.	When the student constantly criticizes classmates.	1	2	3	4	5
__5.	When the student makes inappropriate sexual comments.	1	2	3	4	5
__6.	When the student doesn't know how to ask for help.	1	2	3	4	5
__7.	When the student must deal with parents' divorce.	1	2	3	4	5
__8.	When the student is blamed for something he/she didn't do.	1	2	3	4	5
__9.	When the student has difficulty in school because of substance abuse.	1	2	3	4	5
__10.	When the student responds to a frustrating situation immaturely (temper tantrum, whining, verbal abuse).	1	2	3	4	5
__11.	When the student's trust has been betrayed.	1	2	3	4	5
__12.	When the student has a possession destroyed.	1	2	3	4	5

Copyright c 1989 by Richard S. Neel

NA		No Problem				Significant Problem
__13.	When the student is responsible for negative or disruptive behavior in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
__14.	When the student is provoked to fight by a classmate.	1	2	3	4	5
__15.	When the student is offered drugs or alcohol.	1	2	3	4	5
__16.	When the student feels discriminated against for being a minority.	1	2	3	4	5
__17.	When the student uses any and all behaviors to receive attention.	1	2	3	4	5
__18.	When the student has to deal with bullies or abusive behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
__19.	When the student is rejected by classmates.	1	2	3	4	5
__20.	When the student's temper is not controlled.	1	2	3	4	5
__21.	When the student is hit by someone.	1	2	3	4	5
__22.	When the student carries anger from an earlier confrontation to other situations.	1	2	3	4	5
__23.	When the student "picks on" a classmate.	1	2	3	4	5
__24.	When the student is in a crowded unstructured environment.	1	2	3	4	5
__25.	When the student is pressured by classmates to get into trouble.	1	2	3	4	5
__26.	When the student has poor personal hygiene.	1	2	3	4	5

Copyright c 1989 by Richard S. Neel

NA	No Problem				Significant Problem
__27. When the student feels powerless.	1	2	3	4	5
__28. When the student doesn't respect classmates' "personal space".	1	2	3	4	5
__29. When the student feels insecure with or is unwelcomed by classmates.	1	2	3	4	5
__30. When the student is ridiculed by a teacher or a classmate.	1	2	3	4	5
__31. When the student doesn't see the reward for good social skills.	1	2	3	4	5

Vrsnjr.Doc

Broad Validation Disk #1

Copyright c 1989 by Richard S. Neel

APPENDIX C

A BROAD VALIDATION OF CRITICAL SOCIAL TASKS

A Broad Validation of Critical Social Tasks

There has been an increase in social competency research over the past few years with a majority of that research being conducted in the area of assessment. Studies have focused on identifying socially competent and incompetent children primarily on the basis of adult and peer judgements (Asher & Hymel, 1981; Dodge, 1985; Dodge, McClaskey, & Feldman, 1985; Gresham, 1986). Numerous assessment devices such as peer sociometric interviews, nomination and rating scales, teacher rating instruments, and parent rating scales have been developed. Putallaz and Gottman (1981) labeled such judgements as *indicator variables* because they might indicate the existence of a problem, but do not explain the *nature* of the problem. Which behaviors or skills actually differentiate socially competent from incompetent children, or how those skills might be acquired, remains unclear (Putallaz, 1983; Walker, Shinn, O'Neill, & Ramsey, 1987). Additionally, the assumptions underlying the practice of focusing simply on social behavior as the indicator of complex social interactions have been questioned (Neel & Cessna, 1990).

Dodge and his colleagues have argued that in order to develop instruments that contribute to the planning of social skills interventions for each individual child, the social tasks that present problems for a particular child need to be identified (Dodge, 1985; Dodge et al., 1985). Social tasks were first defined by Dodge (1985) as a set of stimuli (e.g., time frame, cast of persons, general situation) and the resulting end point, or goal. Expanding upon his notions, the present authors have defined social tasks as the problem a child faces when trying to achieve a social goal in a particular situation. Social tasks can then be conceptualized as a process by which a child attempts to achieve a desired outcome (e.g., affiliation, attention, acceptance) in a specific social context (e.g., cast of persons, time frame, general situation). Using this framework, social skills can be viewed as a set of, or series of, behaviors required for various social tasks. A socially competent person would be one who achieved his/her desired outcome in ways judged appropriate by others. The cornerstone of the social task scheme is the notion that social behavior can be conceptualized as occurring in response to specific tasks (Dodge, 1985).

Researchers have used different approaches to determine these specific social tasks. Important social or situational contexts have sometimes been arbitrarily or intuitively determined (Freedman, Rosenthal, Donahoe, Schlundt, & McFall, 1978; Gaffney & McFall, 1981; Spivack, Platt, & Shure, 1976). Children are then trained in component process skills such as problem-solving. Realizing that such an approach does not recognize the importance of specific tasks in assessing social behavior, Dodge et al. (1985) asked 50 elementary school teachers to identify frequently occurring social situations they thought were likely to cause problems for children in grades 2 to 4. They then developed a taxonomy of 44 social tasks in which a child's response to a specific task may be assessed as either competent or incompetent.

Neel, Meadows and Scott (1990) generated two lists of social tasks hypothesized to be problematic for children with behavior problems. The first list of tasks is directed toward children in grades 4, 5, and 6; the second list is directed toward adolescents in grades 7, 8, and 9. Tasks were generated by general and special education teachers, specialists (school counselors and psychologists), peers, and researchers in the area of behavior disorders. It is important to emphasize that the authors' original purpose was to generate *a* list of social tasks, not to identify all social situations encountered by children and adolescents. This purpose was similar to that of Dodge et al. (1985) who identified a set of common and important social tasks children face. Because the social tasks were generated by only a few individuals (approximately 10 in each group) it was felt that they should be validated across a larger population. The purpose of the study discussed here was to validate the list of critical social tasks that had been found to be problematic for children with behavior problems with a larger group of subjects selected form locations nation-wide.

First, we will make a few salient points about the development of the social task lists. The approach of the earlier study expanded the pool of persons to nominate possible problematic social tasks to include general and special education teachers, specialists (school counselors, school psychologists), and peers, as well as researchers in special education. Typically, social skills are generated by experts and researchers in the field of social competency and then validated by teachers or other significant adults (parents, psychologists, counselors) using a forced choice format. Previous research has shown, however, that opinions differ as to what social skills are critical for success (Meadows, Neel, Parker, & Timo, 1989; Williams, Walker, Holmes, Todis, & Fabre, 1989). If social tasks generated were to be representative of activities in the daily lives of the children for whom the authors were programming, it was necessary for these tasks to be generated by those people who interact with these children and by the children themselves. An exhaustive list of potentially relevant tasks would be difficult to compile. However, since teachers, peers, and support staff represent the population most frequently engaged in social interactions involving children in the school environment, their perceptions seemed a reasonable point of departure.

Second, the authors utilized a Delphi survey technique designed to enable the groups to reach consensus on which social tasks were important. Unlike common survey techniques which only ask participants to express opinions on one occasion, the Delphi method begins by asking participants to list those items which they feel are most important and, then, uses several rounds of evaluation to reach consensus on the items selected. This repeated consideration of each item increases the likelihood that a set of critical social tasks would be identified in the initial list of tasks.

A great deal of care was taken to ensure that the social tasks developed would be ones that were critical for social competency. A broader validation of the tasks, however, was essential. The purpose of the study described here was to determine if larger groups of individuals would consider the social tasks developed previously to be problematic for children and adolescents.

METHOD

Subjects

Participants were randomly selected from the membership list of the Council for Children with Behavior Disorders. Members were sent a letter asking them to participate; if they agreed to participate they were asked to supply information as to their type of work with children, their place of employment and number of years spent working with students having behavior disorders.

From the responses we were able to group potential subjects by their expertise into the following categories: (a) teachers of students with behavioral disorders (SET); (b) administrators (ADM); (c) related service personnel (physical therapists, speech therapists, counselors) (RSP); and (d) college professors (EXP) who had professional experience with children and youth with serious behavior problems. Our next step was to recruit general education teachers (GET) and general education students (GES). To do this we contacted the special education teachers who had agreed to participate and asked them to nominate a general education teacher. The general education teachers were then contacted and asked to nominate a general education student whom they felt was socially competent. All participants (and the parents of each student) completed voluntary consent forms. Groups ranged from 24 to 76 subjects with a total of 262 subjects responding to the upper elementary social task list and 263 subjects responding to the junior high social task list (see Table 1).

- Insert Table 1 About Here -

Procedure

The upper elementary Social Task List (U-STL) contained 34 items; the junior high Social Task List (J-STL) contained 41 items. To control for any order effect five versions of each STL were generated by assigning items random numbers. All subjects were asked to read each social task and to rate the perceived difficulty of the task on a Likert scale (1 = no problem, 5 = significant problem). All items receiving ratings of 4 or 5 from at leas 60% of the respondents were retained on the final list of potentially critical social tasks.

RESULTS

Upper Elementary

Responses for each social task item were analyzed across groups as well as within each group. Of the 34 social task items on the U-STL, 27 tasks met the criterion of 60% agreement among all groups; seven tasks were eliminated. Within each group, the general education students had the lowest rate of agreement with just 13 tasks being considered a significant problem for a child with behavior problems (see Table 2).

- Insert Table 2 About Here -

Junior High

Of the 41 social task items on the J-STL, 32 were validated by the nationwide sample; ten tasks did not meet 60% agreement across groups (see Table 3). Students, however, felt that all but six social tasks were critical.

- Insert Table 3 About Here -

DISCUSSION

This is a report on the development of a list of validated critical social tasks that present problems for socially incompetent children. There are many researchers and practitioners working on similar problems and, if we are to develop effective curricula, it is important for each of us to share our work in various stages of development. The purpose of this report is to communicate a list of critical social tasks validated by a number of children, teachers, specialists, and experts and to discuss these findings in terms of the broader theoretical development of social competency curricula.

The social tasks validated in this study represent situations that may be potentially difficult for children and adolescents to negotiate successfully. Previous research has shown that children will be judged socially competent by their teachers, parents, and peers if they can interact in ways that are viewed as competent in a variety of situations (Coie, Dodge, & Coppotelli, 1982; Coie & Kupersmidt, 1983; Dodge, 1983; Neel, Jenkins, & Meadows, 1991; Putallaz, 1983; Putallaz & Gottman, 1981). Being able to successfully negotiate a set of school-related tasks enables students to profit from the educational experience as well as to develop and maintain social relationships. The list presented here does not represent the universe of social tasks; rather, it represents a set or subset of situations that may predict social competency in school settings.

Generally a majority of the tasks were validated by the larger subject pool. In the upper elementary group only three items did not reach 60% agreement by one of the groups and only seven tasks were did not reach consensus overall. The upper elementary general education students had the least amount of agreement on the tasks. They did not reach 60% agreement on twenty-one of the thirty-four tasks. Future research should address consensus agreement among elementary age children.

The adult groups (EXP, SET, ADM, RSP, RET) ratings on the upper elementary STL indicate that adults with more continuous, direct contact with children find more of the tasks to be problematic. Special education teachers, general education teachers, and related service personnel reached 60% consensus on 29, 28, and 28 tasks respectively. Experts and administrators did not reach 60% consensus on nine and ten tasks, respectively.

The differences between groups on the junior high STL are less clear. Special education teachers, general education teachers and students had the highest consensus agreement. Once again these are the individuals who have direct, continuous contact with youth who exhibit behavior problems. Related service personnel had the next highest consensus agreement. Experts and administrators had the lowest consensus agreement. Future research should try to identify why there are differences between these groups of people who interact with children and youths with behavior problems. It is possible that teachers will have to address the social competency level of their students as indicated by which group, that is administrators or other students, that the student is having difficulty with.

Social competency is a complex problem that presents several serious hurdles for researchers and educators. As more is learned about what predicts competent children and adults, the problems of perspective, social task, and the relationships between perceptions, tasks, skills, and judgements become more heightened. This study has reported the findings regarding a set of social tasks that are viewed by children, youth, and adults as being critical in a social process. Further work is needed to fit these findings into a comprehensive framework of social competence. A crucial next step is a more careful evaluation of social tasks viewed as critical by children.

References

Asher, S. R. (1983). Social competence and peer status: Recent advances and future directions. *Child Development*, 54, 1427-1434.

Asher, S. R., & Hymel, Sl (1981). Children's social competence in peer relations: Sociometric and behavioral assessment. In K. Dodge (Ed.), *Social competence in children* (pp. 125-157).

Coie, J. D., Dodge, G., & Coppotelli, H. (1982). Dimensions and types of social status; A corss-age perspective. *Developmental Psychology*, 18(4), 557-570.

Coie, J. D., & Kupersmidt, J. B. (1983). A behavioral analysis of emerging social status in boys' groups. *Child Development*, 54, 1400-1416.

Dodge, K. A. (1983). Behavioral antecendents of peer social status. *Child Development*, 54, 1386-1399.

Dodge, K. A. (1985). Facets of social interaction and the assessment of social competence in children. In B. H. Schneider, K. H. Rubin, & J. E. Ledingham (Eds.), *Children's peer relations: Issues in assessment and intervention* (pp. 3-22). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Dodge, K. A., McClaskey, C. L., & Feldman, E. (1985). Situational approach to the assessment of social competence in children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 344-353.

Freedman, B. J., Rosenthal, L., Donahoe, D. P., Jr., Schlundt, D. G., & McFall, R. M. (1978). A social-behavioral analysis of skills deficits in delinquent and nondelinquent adolescent boys. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46, 1448-1462.

Gaffney, L. R., & McFall, R. M. (1981). A comparison of social skills in delinquent and nondelinquent adolescent girls using a behavioral role-playing inventory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 49, 959-967.

Gresham, F. M. (1986). Conceptual issues in the assessment of social competence in children. In P. S. Strain, M. J. Guralnick, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), *Children's social behavior: Development, assessment, and modification* (pp. 143-179). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Meadows, N. B., Neel, R. S., Parker, G. M., & Timo, K. (in press). A validation of social skills for students with behavior disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*.

Neel, R. S., & Cessna, K. K. (1990). Maybe this behavior does make sense. In R. B. Rutherford, Jr. & S. A. DiGangi (Eds.), *Severe behavior disorders of children and* *youth* (Vol. 13, pp. 18-22). Reston, VA: Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.

Neel, R. S., Jenkins, Z. N., & Meadows, N. B. (in press). Social problem-solving behaviors and aggression in young children: A naturalistic observational study. *Behavioral Disorders*.

Putallaz, M. (1983). Predicting children's sociometric status from their behavior. *Child Development*, 54, 1417-1426.

Putallaz, M., & Gottman, J. M. (1981). An interactional model of children's entry into peer groups. *Child Development*, 52, 986-994.

Spivack, G., Platt, J., & Shure, M. 91976). *The problem-solving approach to adjustment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Walker, H. M. (1984). *Teacher social behavior standards and expectations as determinants of classroom ecology, teacher behavior, and child outcomes* (National Institute of Education paper). Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Walker, H. M., Shinn, M. R., O'Neill, R. E., & Ramsey, E. (1987). A longitudinal assessment of the development of antisocial behavior in boys: Rationale, methodology, and first-year results. *Remedial and Special Education*, 8(4), 7-16.

Williams, S. L., Walker, H. M., Holmes, D., Todis, B., & Fabre, T. R. (1989). Social validation of adolescent social skills by teachers and students. *Remedial and Special Education*, *10*(4), 18-27.

TABLE 1

Subjects

	Upper Elementary	Junior High
EXP	40	37
SET	76	76
ADM	41	45
RSP	38	36
GET	43	35
GES	24	34
Total	262	263

Broadval.doc
Article Disk

Table 2
Upper Elementary

	Total	EXP	SET	ADM	RSP	GET	GES
When a child has differing perceptions about fairness and rules	69.1	70.0	71.0	80.5	73.7	72.1	45.8
When a child responds to failure or rejection by losing self-control	90.9	12.3	94.7	97.6	97.4	86.0	76.6
When a child doesn't accept "no" as an answer	66.2	57.5	65.8	73.2	73.7	69.9	52.0
When a child doesn't consider the feelings of others	62.2	64.1	68.4	61.0	60.5	58.2	51.8
When a child is called names	68.9	67.5	75.0	61.0	84.2	67.5	44.0
When a child overreacts before thinking a situation through	73.0	65.0	80.3	90.2	73.7	65.2	48.0
When a child has a disagreement with classmates	50.4*	46.1	54.0	46.3	71.1	51.2	22.2
When a child is excluded from "the group"	70.3	85.0	72.4	59.5	68.4	79.0	48.1
When a child has been accepted by a group and then rejected	78.0	79.5	72.6	75.7	81.5	88.4	70.3
When a child is trying to settle a conflict with a classmate	45.1*	46.1	51.4	41.5	50.0	44.2	25.9
When a child must deal with failure	67.3	61.6	71.1	78.1	60.5	72.1	50.0
When a child won't compromise with classmates	62.5	58.0	64.5	61.0	68.4	65.1	51.8
When a child blames others	63.1	60.0	69.7	59.5	57.9	74.4	44.4
When a child must deal with being embarrassed or accused	82.3	85.0	84.2	78.1	84.2	83.7	74.0
When a child is hurt by a classmate, physically	82.2	82.5	84.2	92.9	71.0	79.1	80.0
When a child's best friend chooses to spend time with another person	52.5*	47.5	53.3	47.7	68.4	67.5	18.5
When a child picks on classmates	71.9	82.5	75.0	69.1	55.3	79.1	64.0
When a child's poor work is presented in front of classmates	79.5	89.7	70.1	85.4	84.2	81.4	70.3
When a child is encouraged to misbehave	76.5	70.0	80.3	83.0	73.6	76.8	68.0
When a child has a temper tantrum	75.0	75.0	82.9	76.2	71.1	72.1	60.0
When a child competes to earn attention from an adult	49.4*	42.5	51.3	48.7	47.3	58.2	44.0
When a child hits or pushes classmates	84.1	82.5	82.9	90.2	81.6	88.4	77.7
When a child has a problem following the rules	70.4	62.5	72.4	70.7	71.0	79.1	60.0

Table 2 (continued)

	Total	EXP	SET	ADM	RSP	GET	GES
When a child is faced with pressure from classmates to use drugs or alcohol	87.0	79.5	89.3	95.0	94.8	79.1	81.5
When a child takes part in a loosely supervised activity	48.9*	41.0	57.3	48.8	39.5	57.2	37.0
When a child makes fun of classmates	66.3	69.3	69.8	65.8	63.2	69.8	51.8
When a child is upset because a classmate has taken something	62.9	56.4	67.2	65.9	68.5	62.9	48.1
When a child talks to a classmate and is rejected	61.7	76.9	63.2	41.5	73.7	58.2	55.5
When a child is made fun of by classmates	87.1	95.0	85.6	95.2	89.5	90.7	59.2
When a child is rejected by classmates for trying to control an activity	59.4*	52.5	62.7	52.4	68.5	60.5	56.0
When a child is picked on by a classmate	76.7	74.3	82.9	73.2	76.3	74.4	72.0
When a child gets in trouble riding the bus	54.7*	60.0	60.6	58.5	52.6	46.6	40.0
When a child gets mad when disagreeing	65.0	67.5	68.4	70.8	63.2	60.5	52.0
When a child steals from a classmate	79.7	85.0	76.4	88.1	76.3	81.4	70.3

Key:
EXP = Experts (Researchers)
SET = Special Education Teachers
ADM = Administrators
RSP = Related Service Personnel (Counselors, Speech Therapists)
RET = Regular Education Teachers
RES = Regular Education Students
* = less than 60 % agreement, task dropped from final list

Table 3
Junior High

	Total	EXP	SET	ADM	RSP	GET	GES
When a student is put down in front of classmates	83.3	91.9	81.6	77.7	83.4	80.0	88.2
When a student doesn't accept and cope with consequences of own behavior	86.4	72.9	96.1	91.1	91.6	88.6	64.7
When a student can't identify and verbalize feelings	77.2	78.4	85.5	71.1	72.2	74.3	73.5
When a student constantly criticizes classmates	70.7	70.2	79.3	64.5	74.3	62.8	64.7
When a student makes inappropriate sexual comments	74.2	70.2	73.7	77.8	78.8	71.4	73.5
When a student doesn't know how to ask for help	67.6	54.0	68.4	64.5	71.4	71.5	76.4
When a student must deal with parents divorce	70.5	62.1	72.8	64.4	63.9	77.2	82.4
When a student is blamed for something he/she didn't do	73.5	64.8	74.1	75.5	77.8	77.2	70.5
When a student has difficulty in school because of substance abuse	90.1	91.9	89.6	91.1	94.3	88.6	85.3
When a student responds to a frustrating situation immaturely (temper tantrum, whining, verbal abuse)	71.8	58.4	83.2	80.0	57.2	68.6	67.7
When a student gets angry	56.1*	54.0	63.7	64.4	58.3	45.7	38.2
When a student's feelings are hurt	53.6*	38.9	56.6	43.1	52.8	65.8	64.7
When a student's trust has been betrayed	77.7	78.4	78.0	71.1	83.3	74.3	82.3
When a student has a possession destroyed	64.0	64.8	57.2	59.8	69.4	71.4	73.5
When a student is responsible for negative or disruptive behavior in the classroom	74.8	83.3	84.2	77.8	75.0	68.6	47.1
When a student is provoked to fight by a classmate	80.2	80.5	85.5	77.8	80.6	71.4	79.5
When a student is offered drugs or alcohol	78.2	69.4	81.5	75.0	75.0	85.7	79.4
When a student feels discriminated against for being a minority	70.5	66.7	72.3	57.7	80.0	65.7	82.4
When a student uses any and all behaviors to receive attention	82.4	86.1	87.0	86.7	91.4	74.3	61.8
When a student is teased by a classmate	58.6*	50.0	60.0	44.5	55.5	68.6	76.4
When a student has to deal with bullies or abusive behavior	78.3	77.8	83.2	75.6	75.0	77.2	76.5
When a student is rejected by classmates	78.6	81.1	78.0	68.9	76.4	85.7	85.3

Table 3 (continued)

	Total	EXP	SET	ADM	RSP	GET	GES
When a student's temper is not controlled	87.8	91.8	94.8	91.1	85.7	85.7	67.7
When a student is hit by someone	83.3	83.7	77.9	88.9	85.7	77.1	91.2
When a student carries anger from an earlier situation to other situations	82.9	75.6	88.4	77.8	94.3	80.0	76.5
When a student is criticized	57.4*	32.4	62.4	50.0	61.1	54.3	82.4
When a student acts immaturely with classmates	35.7*	30.6	45.5	31.1	38.9	37.1	20.6
When a student "picks on" a classmate	61.8	59.4	68.4	51.1	66.7	58.8	61.7
When a student is in a crowded unstructured environment	63.1	38.8	72.8	66.7	72.2	58.0	55.9
When a student is pressured by classmates to get into trouble	73.1	62.1	79.2	66.7	77.8	71.4	76.5
When a student is the subject of rumors	52.5*	37.8	54.6	33.4	62.8	51.4	82.4
When a student has poor personal hygiene	68.6	62.1	74.1	64.5	61.1	68.4	76.4
When a student has trouble staying on a task	53.8*	43.2	61.1	50.0	54.3	62.9	44.1
When a student feels powerless	65.4	66.6	65.0	64.4	77.8	51.4	67.4
When a student doesn't respect classmates' "personal space"	62.9	51.3	70.0	62.2	55.6	71.4	58.8
When a student feels insecure with or is unwelcomed by classmates	72.0	64.8	75.4	55.6	72.2	74.3	91.2
When a student is ridiculed by a teacher or a classmate	88.5	91.9	88.0	90.9	94.4	82.9	81.8
When a student is expected to act tough towards other kids	53.6*	55.5	48.7	51.1	57.2	57.1	58.9
When a student doesn't see the reward for good social skills	70.2	63.9	74.1	73.4	71.4	71.4	61.7
When a student doesn't fit in with classmates	58.6*	48.6	62.4	48.9	57.7	74.3	58.8
When a student is faced with standing up for his/her rights	58.6*	56.7	58.5	51.2	54.2	68.6	64.7

Key:
EXP = Experts (Researchers)
SET = Special Education Teachers
ADM = Administrators
RSP = Related Service Personnel (Counselors, Speech Therapists)
RET = Regular Education Teachers
RES = Regular Education Students
* = less than 60 % agreement, task dropped from final list

APPENDIX D

CREATING AN INITIAL CRITICAL SOCIAL TASK TAXONOMY

Creating an Initial Critical Social Task Taxonomy

Susan G. Gelhar

University of Washington

Abstract

The literature suggests that social competence can be conceptualized as the ability to select a set of behaviors or strategies that will produce a favorable outcome in a particular social situation. This study is part of a research project designed to identify potentially critical social tasks and develop situation-sensitive assessment procedures which inform effective interventions for students with behavior disorders. The purpose of the present study was to create a preliminary critical social task taxonomy by classifying problematic situations according to generally recognized conceptual categories.

Given a set of cards printed with potentially problematic situations for either Upper Elementary (UE) or Junior High (JR) students, subjects performed a card sort activity which involved placing each situation card into one of several predetermined categories. Of the 34 UE items, 68% were classified with a high level of agreement, thus indicating reasonable face validity of the UE categories. However, the level of agreement was not consistent for the JR categories. The findings were discussed in terms of possible explanations for the variance, methodological limitations, and implications for further research. The organization of social tasks according to logical categories will assist in efficient and consistent communication among those involved in the measurement and interpretation of student behavior.

Recently, there has been an increase in research concerning the analysis of social interaction within specific situations (e.g., Dodge, 1985; Freedman, Rosenthal, Donahoe, Schlundt, & McFall, 1978; Goldfried & D'Zurilla, 1969; Krasnor & Rubin, 1983). Dodge formulated an information processing model of social interaction in which "social behavior can be conceptualized as occurring in response to specific tasks...alternately known as stimuli, settings, situations, contexts, and domains" (p. 4). It is this concept of task that has been adopted for the present study. A social task is thus defined as a process by which a child attempts to achieve a desired outcome (e.g., attention, acceptance) in a specific social context (Neel, Meadows, & Scott, 1990). From this perspective, social skills can be viewed as a set (or series) of behaviors required within various social tasks. With the goal or task having been identified, social competence can thus be defined as a child's selection of a set of behaviors or strategies that will produce a favorable outcome in that particular situation. For a child to be successful in school, he or she needs to master the skills required by various social tasks.

Goldfried and d'Zurilla (1969) based their work on the conceptualization of behavioral competence as responses to "problematic situations." McFall and his colleagues used a similar approach to identify situation-specific social skills deficits in delinquent boys (Freedman et al., 1978) and girls (Gaffney & McFall, 1981). Their assessment procedures included generating an inventory of problematic social situations and evaluating competence in each situation. Similarly, Dodge, McClaskey, and Feldman (1985) studied social tasks for elementary school children and demonstrated the feasibility of describing the contexts in which children experience peer difficulties through use of a social task taxonomy generated by teachers and clinicians.

The current study was undertaken to create a critical social task taxonomy by classifying problematic situation tasks into generally recognized categories. The research question involved determining the level of agreement with which social task items could be grouped into conceptual categories for the sake of efficiency and clarity. The resulting taxonomy is to be used in an on-going research project designed to evaluate and remedy the social development problems of children with behavior disorders.

The present investigation was the third in a series of studies designed to create an initial list of potentially critical social tasks, identify component skills within these tasks, and develop interventions to teach skills within specific social contexts. The use of the term "critical" in this study implies that how a student responds to a specific task makes a difference in how he or she is judged as to whether the response is considered to fall within the normal range of acceptable behavior. A goal of this research program is to identify critical tasks and behaviors so skills more likely to result in being judged competent can be taught.

The first step to establish the relevance and importance of social tasks in the school setting for students with behavior disorders was to survey individuals most frequently engaged in social interactions with these children. In Study 1, teachers, other professionals, and peers were surveyed using a Delphi method to arrive at a set of specific school-related social tasks likely to be considered problematic for socially incompetent students of two age groups: grades 4-6 (upper elementary) and grades 7-9 (junior high). Study 2 determined the representativeness of the survey results by expanding the original groups and asking participants to rate the identified tasks in terms of perceived importance. Items rated highly by at least 60% of the members of any one group were retained for inclusion in the current study, creating a preliminary critical task taxonomy.

The purpose of the present study was to create a preliminary critical social task taxonomy by classifying the tasks identified in Study 1 into generally recognized categories. If it is possible to interpret a wide range of social task situations with relatively few distinct, well-defined categories, then the differences between subsets of tasks will be better understood. Organization of tasks according to conceptual categories will assist in efficient and consistent communication among those involved in the measurement and interpretation of student behavior. This study is a step toward the development of situation-sensitive assessment procedures which contribute to effective interventions for each individual student.

Method

Subjects & Setting

The subjects were 100 University of Washington graduate and undergraduate students recruited via class announcements from the College of Education and the Sociology Department. The first 50 males and the first 50 females who volunteered and signed consent forms were accepted for participation. Due to the limited number of male students enrolled in the College of Education, it was necessary to extend recruitment to the Sociology Department to achieve a balance in gender. No other criteria for selection were employed. The research activity was conducted with small groups before and after regular classes on campus [illegible]oom settings.

Procedures

Potentially critical social tasks had been identified in Study 1 using a method similar to that outlined by Dodge, McClaskey, and Feldman (1985) in which teachers were asked to nominate common situations encountered in daily school activities thought to be problematic for students with behavior problems. Study 1 expanded the pool of persons surveyed to include general and special education teachers, specialists and experts, and peers. Half of the participants were associated with upper elementary children(grades 4-6) and the other half responded according to their experience with junior high students (grades 7-9). A Delphi survey technique was used in which participants were asked to list important social tasks throughout several rounds of evaluation to reach consensus. The first round lists consisted of 317 upper elementary social tasks and 370 junior high social tasks; round three reduced the lists to 34 and 41 social tasks respectively.

For the present study, the potentially critical social task items were transcribed into a uniform format and printed on individual 3x5 cards. The upper elementary set consisted of 34 cards; the junior high set consisted of 41. A panel of six specialists working in the field of behavioral disorders met to review possible general category titles based upon personal experience and categories suggested in the literature (Dodge et al., 1985). The panel's intent was to arrive at category titles/labels which were (a) nonredundant; (b) easily recognized by and meaningful to nonprofessionals, as well as professionals; (c) worded to minimize duplication of exact terms or language found in any particular task item; (d) broad enough to encompass more than one of the identified social tasks but specific enough to have practical utility; and (e) stated without a strong negative or positive connotation.

It was agreed that the study would employ the following elementary classifications: Rules/Expectations, Conflicts, Teasing Others, Being Teased, Self-Control, Rejection, Dealing with Feedback±, and Peer Pressure. The junior high classifications included: Classroom Expectations, Response to Authority, Communicating with Others, Negative Behavior from Others, Provoking Peers, Self-Control, and Peer Pressure. The eight category titles for each level were printed on individual envelopes and a ninth envelope was labeled Other. It was determined that the label would be presented without an accompanying definition or example for the reason that the label concepts were to be evaluated for their ready recognizability and face validity.

Each subject was given randomly either a set of 34 elementary cards and envelopes or a set of 41 junior high cards and envelopes, as well an instruction sheet. All sets of cards were mixed thoroughly to ensure random order of items. The experimenter introduced the card sort with a brief, prepared statement of the purpose of the activity. Participants were told that they could ask the experimenter for clarification but that they should avoid discussing card sort selections with other group members. Subjects were instructed to place the envelopes so that all category titles were visible. They were then asked to read each social task card and to place it in the envelope with the category title which seemed to best fit the task. They were allowed to review their decisions and change their placements. Subjects were instructed to place any item which they were unable to match with the predetermined categories into the envelope marked Other and to write a suggested general category title for that type of task. Upon return of the completed card sort and signed consent form, a subject number was assigned and coded for gender.

Data Analysis

The data were recorded first by hand and then compiled on a frequency grid to determine distributions across categories and level of agreement. A chi-square test was performed to analyze the results for possible gender differences, but due to the size of the sample, cell frequencies were less than five for many items, thus rendering the analysis invalid.

Results

Upper Elementary. A list of 34 potentially critical social tasks for upper elementary children who have poor social skills is presented in Table 1. The level of agreement among respondents for placing each item in one of the predetermined categories in the card sort activity is indicated in percentages and tasks are listed in descending level of agreement. Of the 34 problematic social tasks, 23

(68%) were classified in like categories by over 60% of the respondents; six of the items were agreed upon by 90-98%.

The 23 items which met the 60% criterion for inclusion in the initial critical social task taxonomy were placed consistently in seven of the eight predetermined labeled categories (see Table 2). The tasks which were associated most often with the nonrepresented category, Dealing with Feedback, pertained to dealing with failure, embarrassment, or accusations.

Insert TABLES 1 & 2 about here

Of the total 34 task items, 20 were placed in the Other category by one or more of the study participants. For three items, there was a relatively high number of respondents who indicated that the predetermined category titles did not adequately capture the meaning of the social tasks described. These included (a) when a child competes to earn attention from an adult (38%), (b) when a child doesn't consider the feelings of others (26%), and (c) when a child blames others (20%). Placement of each of these three items by the remainder of the participants ranged across six of the eight categories (see Table 1), resulting in the lowest levels of agreement. Table 3 presents category titles suggested by respondents for items which they had placed in the Other category.

A comparison of the results of the present study with those of Study 2 (broad validation to determine perceived importance) indicated that of the nine items rated as most important by over 80% of the Study 2 respondents, three failed to reach the 60% agreement criterion for inclusion in the current taxonomy.

Insert TABLES 3&4 about here

Junior High. A list of 41 potentially critical social tasks for junior high students who have poor social skills is presented in Table 4. The level of agreement among respondents for placing each item in one of the predetermined categories in the card sort activity is indicated in percentages. Of the 41 problematic social tasks, 18 (44%) were classified in like categories by over 60% of the respondents; only one task item was agreed upon at a level over 90%.

The 18 items which met the 60% criterion for inclusion in the initial critical social task taxonomy were placed consistently in six of the eight predetermined labeled categories (see Table 5). The nonrepresented categories were named Classroom Expectations and Response to Authority.

Insert TABLE 5 about here

Of the total 41 tasks, 29 were placed in the Other category by one or more respondents. Three items were identified consistently by the respondents as describing tasks which were not represented adequately by any of the offered category titles. These included (a) when a student has poor personal hygiene (46%), (b) when a student doesn't see the reward for good social skills (26%), and (c) when a student must deal with parents' divorce (26%). Table 3 presents category titles suggested by respondents for items placed in the

Other category.

When compared to the results of Study 2, the present Junior High results indicated that, of the nine items rated as most important by over 80% of the Study 2 respondents, five failed to be included in the current taxonomy.

Discussion

The present investigation sought to evaluate the face validity of general category titles selected to represent the range of problematic social tasks faced by students with behavior disorders in a school setting.

One issue that is basic to the labeling of subsets of social task items is the correspondence between the label and the categorical nature of the behaviors associated with those items (Bullock, Wilson, & Campbell, 1990). Labels generally are a result of the interpretation of the behavior described in the items, but a label may also influence interpretation of a task according to which category it has been reported under. For example, the task item reading, "When a child must deal with failure" may be interpreted differently when assessed under the label Rejection than when found under the heading Dealing with Feedback. The assigning of an item to a category must be empirically based to assure accurate and consistent communication for appropriate assessment and intervention.

Limitations exist in the use of statistical factor analyses to classify behavioral dimensions or situations. For example, "exploratory factor analysis produces indeterminate solutions such that any given solution depends upon (a) the items placed in the analysis, (b) the computation method, and (c) the type of rotation used for a final solution" (Bullock et al., 1990, p.87). Efforts to construct situational taxonomies based on statistical analyses have not always proven useful. For instance, Freedman et al. (1978) scored subjects' performance competence for each situational item generated and performed hierarchical cluster analytic techniques on the basis of similarity of scores. They found that situational clusters differed depending on the technique used and that results were generally uninterpretable. It was proposed that classifying situations on the basis of similarity among stimulus properties was the more logical approach.

The preliminary work of the current study reflects the views of a sample group of non-experts asked to determine logically if particular social tasks could be categorized according to generally recognized cognitive concepts; whether the category titles selected here actually represent the truly troublesome situations for any given individual remains to be studied.

The card sort activity was carried out with two distinct sets of data: one group of subjects classified social tasks identified as potentially problematic for children in upper elementary (UE) grades and the other group classified tasks generated for junior high (JR) school students. The UE and JR task card sets were distributed randomly within the same pool of participants. The use of the terms upper elementary and junior high was meant to convey a general setting difference; when the social tasks were generated in Study 1, no developmental measures were utilized to determine specific age differences. Because the results were considerably different for the two groups in the present study, the findings are summarized separately and possible explanations for these differences are presented. Discussion of the limitations of the present study and implications for future research are included.

Upper Elementary. Subjects performing the upper elementary card sort activity grouped a majority of the social task items under the predetermined category titles with a level of agreement of over 60%, indicating that the titles adequately represented those task situations. This finding is consistent with that of Dodge, McClaskey, and Feldman (1985) who carried out a similar investigation based on social tasks for school children in grades 2-4. An important conclusion that can be made on the basis of the present findings and past research is that conceptual categories with an acceptable degree of face validity can be used to classify a range of behavioral situations.

Of our 34 problematic situations, 23 were retained to create an initial critical social task taxonomy. The goal of this study was to contribute to the development of a meaningful and precise system to assess social skill deficits in individuals with behavior disorders. Our intention was to be as parsimonious as possible while retaining a sufficient number of items to capture a fair sampling of frequently occurring social tasks. It is important to emphasize that the resulting taxonomy is a list, not the list of critical tasks that may discriminate socially incompetent from socially competent students.

Junior High. Subjects performing the junior high card sort demonstrated a level of agreement over 60% on 22 of the 41 social task items. Because the activity and the subject pool were fundamentally the same for this group and the elementary group, we can assume that the lower number of items meeting the criterion for inclusion (44% JR as opposed to 68% UE) was due to factors relating to the items or the categories themselves.

One possible interpretation is that there may have been too much variance introduced by the construction of the items. Careful inspection of the language and wording suggests that the items may vary in degree of specificity. Some items describe specific, observable behaviors (e.g., "When a student has a possession destroyed"), whereas others denote a more global reference (e.g., "When a student doesn't fit in with classmates"). Others are decidedly vague ("When a student doesn't see the reward for good social skills"). A comparison of two items written at different levels of specificity illustrates this point. The task, "When a student acts immaturely with classmates" received 28% agreement as a Self-Control problem; whereas "When a student responds to a frustrating situation immaturely (temper tantrum, whining, verbal abuse)" was classified with 78% agreement. Study 1 was committed to the importance of allowing for spontaneous responses to a survey calling for actual, real-life situations. We recognize the difficulty of editing such responses; however if a revised study were to be conducted, this issue would need careful consideration.

A second factor that may have influenced the placement of an item into a certain category is that of perspective. The study participants may have assumed a particular point of view in their reading of the social task items. For example, one subject may have based responses on actual classroom teaching experience, whereas another may have responded from a student's perspective. Although the expressed purpose of Study 1 was to encompass the perspectives of teachers, peers, and others; the present research activity may have been better served by making the instructions to the respondents more explicit in this regard. The broader issue suggested here is the need to study the impact of peers' perceptions on the importance of specific social tasks.

Perhaps future research will clarify the need for assessment instruments validated specifically on a subset of peer-determined situations as one component of a multidimensional approach to predict social competence. Neel, Meadows, and Scott (1990) have begun to explore this notion. Results of their preliminary work confirmed previous findings (Williams, Walker, Holmes, Todis, & Fabre, 1989) that adults and children differ as to which social skills are viewed as critical. Neel et al. found that students, when asked to list potentially problematic social situations, generated social tasks which were more peer-to-peer and specific in nature than those listed by adults. Neel and his colleagues suggested that, whereas adults may focus on tasks associated with future success and adjustment, students may focus on those necessary for current acceptance. They proposed that "what may be emerging in this literature is a two by two matrix of current versus future acceptance on one axis, and adult versus peer-required social skills on the other" (p.10). The next taxonomies may very well be developed along these lines, including the surveying of peers' perceptions as to the importance of social tasks.

A third explanation for the difficulty in classifying some items for the taxonomy is that they may have been sufficiently unique to require separate categories in and of themselves. This was indicated by the more frequent placement of certain items (e.g., "When a student has poor personal hygiene" or "When a student must deal with parents' divorce") into the Other category. Because there was not a consensus of 60% on any suggested category labels from the Other list, no additional categories were created for the taxonomy at this time. Special consideration may be warranted, especially for those items that had also been rated as very important in Study 2. Rather than simply dropping the social tasks that were not readily categorized, the implication is that there may be a need for Round 2 analysis to add or adjust categories to accommodate "high valence" situations.

Because the items from the UE and JR groups do not appear to differ significantly on the above characteristics, it is likely that other factors contributed to the lower level of agreement on the junior high tasks as well. It is possible that one or more of the categories were too broad or were not well-defined. This notion is supported by the appearance of a pattern in the raw data in which the placement of several items was split consistently between two categories, Rejection and Negative Behavior from Others. The card sort activity had been piloted with a small number of outside subjects to test the categories, the results of which indicated reasonable face validity. However, the findings of the present study indicate a need for more rigorous preliminary work in establishing clear categories. It is difficult to write category labels which are sufficiently broad to accommodate a range of behaviors and yet specific enough to accomplish the goal of collapsing the realm of social tasks into a practical, workable number of categories.

Conclusion. It has been suggested thus far that the results of the current investigation be viewed with several factors in mind. These include: the introduction of variance during item construction, the level of specificity of the task description, the issue of perspective, the importance of student input, and the degree of category clarity. As a part of the ongoing research project described previously, the reporting of this study should also be viewed in terms of the broader theoretical development of social competence assessment procedures with relevance for effective interventions and positive outcomes.

It is noteworthy that since Dodge (1985) first proposed the social task model for assessing social competence, other researchers have found utility in its various elements to develop and fine-tune their own theories. For instance, Rubin and Krasnor (1986) have developed a social problem-solving model based on an observational method which includes goal and strategy taxonomies as well as episodic sequence coding to determine persistence, flexibility, and responsiveness to feedback following failure. This type of research could contribute to the next objective of the current project, the development of a behavioral observation protocol to assess the component skills within specific social tasks. Another example of compatible research is that of Parkhurst and Asher's (1985) study of the role of children's goals in their behavior. The social task conceptualization could also be enhanced by including elements of a scheme such as Neel's (1984) functional approach, in which an individual's competence is determined not only by the acceptance of behavior by others, but also by the ability of the behavior to produce the desired result or effect. The level of detail possible within such a framework to account for the complexity of social interactions would certainly advance the individualized assessment needed to plan comprehensive interventions.

The findings of this study contribute to the effort to develop assessment procedures which employ terms and concepts that are logical and meaningful, and accurately represent behavioral dimensions of potentially problematic situations for students with behavior disorders. The present study established the face validity of the Upper Elementary social task taxonomy categories. This is the essential first step in the effort to ensure discriminant and convergent validity in relation to other measures of social competence. In its final form, the critical social task taxonomy may be used in conjunction with sociometric methods to evaluate the social validity of student outcomes following intervention. If a similar measure is developed for senior high students, such as system would make a significant contribution to longitudinal research seeking to define more precisely the relationship between social incompetence in early grades and problems in later years. Currently, longitudinal studies which employ the same measure to select and reevaluate subjects are very few in number (Strain, Cooke, & Apolloni, 1976). The taxonomy and the planned behavioral observation protocol also would benefit the collection of normative data. This would be useful in the generation of information on the key components of socially competent behavior and in the establishment of the normal range target limits for intervention.

There is an encouraging trend in the field of social competence toward researching differentiated assessment procedures. This trend appears to be driven by the recognition of the high degree of heterogeneity and complexity existing within social interactions and across situations. Much work remains to be done to strengthen a research base upon which individualized and contextually relevant assessment procedures and interventions can be built. By creating an initial social task taxonomy, the present study has contributed to the first step in developing programs with potential to better serve children with behavior disorders. The next major step is to investigate the specific component skills needed for children to be successful within social tasks as they relate to perceptions and judgments of important social outcomes.

References

Bullock, L. M., Wilson, M. J., & Campbell, R. E. (1990). Inquiry into the commonality of items from seven behavior rating scales: A preliminary examination. Behavioral Disorders, 15(2), 87-99.

Cooke, T. P., & Apolloni, T. (1976). Developing positive social-emotional behaviors: A study of training and generalization effects. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 9, 64-78.

Dodge, K. A. (1985). Facets of social interaction and the assessment of social competence in children. In B.H. Schneider, K.H. Rubin, & J.E. Ledingham (Eds.), Children's peer relations: Issues in assessment and intervention (pp. 3-22). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Dodge, K. A., McClaskey, C. L., & Feldman, E. (1985). A situational approach to the assessment of social competence in children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53(3), 344-353.

Freedman, B. J., Rosenthal, L., Donahoe, C. P., Jr., Schlundt, D. G., & McFall, R. M. (1978). A social-behavioral analysis of skills deficits in delinquent and nondelinquent adolescent boys. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 1448-1462.

Gaffney, L. R., & McFall, R. M. (1981). A comparison of social skills in delinquent and nondelinquent girls using a behavioral role-playing inventory. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 959-967.

Goldfried, M. R., & D'Zurilla, T. J. (1969). A behavioral-analytic model assessing competence. In D. Spielberger (Ed.), Current topics in clinical and community psychology (Vol. 1), (pp. 513-539). New York: Academic Press.

Gresham, F. M. (1986). Conceptual issues in the assessment of social competence in children. In P. S. Strain, M. J. Guralnick, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), Children's social behavior: Development, assessment, and modification, (pp. 143-179). Florida: Academic Press.

Krasnor, L., & Rubin, K. (1983). Preschool social problem solving: Attempts and outcomes in naturalistic interaction. Child Development, 54, 1545-1558.

McFall, R. M. (1982). A review and reformulation of the concept of social skills. Behavioral Assessment, 4, 1-35.

Neel, R. S., Meadows, N. B., & Scott, C. M. (1990). Determining social tasks: A preliminary report. In R. B. Rutherford (Ed.), Monograph in Behavioral Disorders, Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders, Reston, VA: Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.

Neel, R. S. (1984). Teaching social routines to behaviorally disordered youth [Monograph]. In J. K. Grosennick, S. L. Huntze, E. McGinnis, & C. R. Smith, (Eds.), Social/Affective Interventions in Behavioral Disorders, March, 152-184.

Parkhurst, J. T., & Asher, S. R. (1985). Goals and concerns: Implications for the study of children's social competence. In B. Lahey & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), Advances in clinical child psychology. New York: Plenum.

Strain, P. S., Cooke, T. P., & Apolloni, T. (1976). Teaching exceptional children: Assessing and modifying social behavior. New York: Academic Press.

Taylor, A., & Asher, S. (1985). Children's goals and social competence: Individual differences in a game-playing context. In T. M. Field (Ed.), Friendships among normal and handicapped children. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Walker, H. M., & Fabre, T. R. (1987). Assessment of behavior disorders in the school setting: Issues, problems, and strategies revisited. In N. Haring (Ed.), Measuring and managing behavior disorders (pp. 198-243). Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Williams, S. L., Walker, H. M., Holmes, D., Todis, B., & Fabre, T. R. (1989). Social validation of adolescent social skills by teachers and students. Remedial and Special Education, 10(4), 18-27.

Table 1

Upper Elementary Category Agreements*

SOCIAL TASK	CATEGORIES**								
When a child...	0T	RE	CN	TO	BT	SC	RJ	DF	PP
makes fun of classmates.	00	00	02	**98**	00	00	00	00	00
is faced with pressure from classmates to use drugs or alcohol.	00	00	00	00	00	02	02	00	**96**
has a disagreement with classmates.	00	00	**96**	00	00	02	00	02	00
has a problem following the rules.	00	**94**	02	00	00	04	00	00	00
has differing perception about fairness and rules.	00	**90**	00	00	00	10	00	00	00
has a temper tantrum.	02	02	00	00	00	**90**	02	04	00
overreacts before thinking a situation through.	02	02	02	00	00	88	00	00	00
best friend chooses to spend time with another person.	00	00	10	02	00	00	**84**	00	04
talks to a classmate and is rejected.	00	00	02	00	04	00	**84**	10	00
is called names.	00	00	08	00	**82**	00	10	00	00
is encouraged to misbehave.	00	02	00	00	00	10	00	08	**80**
picks on classmates.	02	00	10	**78**	00	06	02	00	02
is made fun of by classmates.	00	00	00	04	**78**	00	16	02	00
has been accepted by a group and then rejected.	00	00	06	00	00	00	**78**	06	10
is excluded from "the group."	00	00	02	00	00	00	**76**	00	22
is trying to settle a conflict with a classmate.	06	06	**72**	00	00	06	02	08	00
is picked on by a classmate.	00	00	14	02	**72**	00	10	00	00
is hurt by a classmate, physically.	14	00	70	00	06	06	04	00	00

*Level of agreement expressed in %s.

** OT- Other
RE- Rules/Expectations
CN-Conflicts
TO-Teasing Others
BT-Being Teased
SC-Self Control
RJ-Rejection
DF-Dealing with Feedback+
PP-Peer Pressure

Table 1 (continued)

SOCIAL TASK	CATEGORIES**								
When a child...	0T	RE	CN	TO	BT	SC	RJ	DF	PP
gets in trouble riding the bus.	06	**68**	08	00	00	16	00	02	00
won't compromise with classmates.	04	08	**66**	00	00	06	02	06	08
responds to failure or rejection by losing self-control.	04	00	00	00	00	**66**	06	22	00
gets mad when disagreeing.	02	04	18	00	00	**66**	00	10	00
is upset because a classmate has taken something.	06	14	**62**	02	00	16	00	00	00
must deal with failure.	02	00	10	00	00	08	18	58	04
takes part in a loosely supervised activity.	10	54	02	00	00	24	00	04	06
is rejected by classmates for trying to control an activity.	02	00	16	00	04	06	48	12	12
steals from a classmate.	08	46	16	02	00	22	02	02	02
hits or pushes classmates.	04	02	46	08	00	40	00	00	00
must deal with being embarrassed or accused.	00	04	08	00	12	12	14	40	10
doesn't accept "no" as an answer.	04	18	18	00	00	16	00	40	00
poor work is presented in front of classmates.	08	02	02	00	04	00	38	32	14
competes to earn attention from an adult.	38	12	16	00	00	10	10	10	04
blames others.	20	14	30	04	00	12	02	18	00
doesn't consider the feelings of others.	26	14	08	28	00	18	02	04	00

*Level of agreement expressed in %s.

** OT- Other
RE- Rules/Expectations
CN-Conflicts
TO-Teasing Others
BT-Being Teased
SC-Self Control
RJ-Rejection
DF-Dealing with Feedback$^+$
PP-Peer Pressure

Table 2

Upper Elementary Critical Social Task Taxonomy

SELF-CONTROL When a child responds to failure or rejection by losing self control. When a child gets mad when disagreeing. When a child has a temper tantrum. When a child overreacts before thinking a situation through.	BEING TEASED When a child is made fun of by classmates. When a child is picked on by a classmate. When a child is called names. TEASING OTHERS When a child makes fun of classmates When a child picks on classmates
CONFLICT When a child is hurt by a classmate, physically. When a child is upset because a classmate has taken something. When a child is trying to settle a conflict with a classmate. When a child has a disagreement with classmates. When a child won't compromise with classmates.	PEER PRESSURE When a child is faced with pressure from classmates to use drugs or alcohol. When a child is encouraged to misbehave.
REJECTION When a child has been accepted into a group and then rejected. When a child is excluded from "the group." When a child's best friend chooses to spend time with another person. When a child talks to a classmate and is rejected.	RULES/EXPECTATIONS When a child has differing perceptions about fairness and rules. When a child has a problem following the rules. When a child gets in trouble riding the bus.

Table 3

Category Titles Suggested by Respondents for Items Classified as OTHER

UPPER ELEMENTARY:

Self-Esteem
Empathy
Feelings/Emotions
Love/Relationships
Embarrassment/Humiliation
Need for Approval
Egocentrism
Moral Development
Insecurity
Participation
Cooperation
Competition/Competitiveness
System Manipulation
Taking Responsibility
Physical Aggression
Accepting Consequences
Violence
Anger

JUNIOR HIGH:

Self-Image
Self-Assertion
Self-Esteem
Self-Care/Grooming
Self-Concept
Personal Traits
Sexuality
Environment
Family Influence
Home Influence
Parental Influence
Socialization
Responsibility
Student Rights

Table 4

Junior High Category Agreements*

SOCIAL TASK	CATEGORIES**								
When a student...	0T	RA	CE	CO	NB	SC	RJ	PV	PP
can't identify and verbalize feelings.	02	00	00	**92**	00	06	00	00	00
is expected to act tough towards other kids.	02	00	02	04	00	02	00	02	**88**
is rejected by classmates.	00	00	00	02	08	00	**88**	02	00
has to deal with bullies or abusive behavior.	00	00	00	04	**86**	02	02	06	00
is hit by someone.	00	02	00	00	**86**	02	02	08	00
is offered drugs or alcohol.	00	00	00	00	06	10	00	00	**84**
temper is not controlled.	00	02	04	04	04	**84**	02	00	00
is pressured by classmates to get into trouble.	00	00	00	02	10	02	00	02	**84**
"picks on" a classmate.	02	02	00	02	06	06	00	**80**	02
responds to a frustrating situation immaturely (temper tantrum, whining, verbal abuse).	04	00	04	12	00	**78**	02	00	00
doesn't know how to ask for help.	02	08	10	**78**	00	00	02	00	00
feels insecure with or is unwelcomed by classmates.	02	00	00	08	10	04	**72**	00	04
gets angry.	00	02	02	24	02	**70**	00	00	00
has a possession destroyed.	04	00	00	02	**68**	14	10	02	00
doesn't fit in with classmates.	02	00	02	12	02	00	**66**	00	16
constantly criticizes classmates.	00	02	00	24	02	02	04	**66**	00
is teased by a classmate.	00	00	00	02	**64**	00	04	12	08
carries anger from an earlier confrontation to other situations.	04	02	00	16	08	**64**	02	04	00
feelings are hurt.	04	00	04	10	22	02	58	00	00
is put down in front of classmates.	02	04	02	00	38	00	52	00	02

*Level of agreement expressed in %s.

** OT- Other
RA-Response to Authority
CE-Classroom Expectations
CO-Communicating With Others
NB-Negative Behaviors From Others
SC-Self Control
RJ-Rejection
PV-Provoking Peers
PP-Peer Pressure

Table 4 (continued)

SOCIAL TASK	CATEGORIES**								
When a student...	0T	RA	CE	CO	NB	SC	RJ	PV	PP
doesn't accept and cope with consequences of own behavior.	12	30	00	02	00	52	04	00	00
doesn't respect classmates' "personal space."	00	04	24	04	06	10	00	52	00
is the subject of rumors.	04	02	00	08	50	00	22	04	10
has trouble staying on a task.	08	02	50	02	00	38	00	00	00
feels discriminated against for being a minority.	02	00	02	04	36	00	50	00	06
is blamed for something s/he didn't do.	10	14	02	10	50	02	12	00	00
is ridiculed by a teacher or a classmate.	02	04	08	00	50	00	34	02	00
trust has been betrayed.	06	02	00	06	32	02	48	02	02
has poor personal hygiene.	46	04	14	00	00	20	10	02	04
is criticized.	02	04	02	06	42	00	40	02	02
is faced with standing up for his/her rights.	02	26	02	40	00	12	00	04	14
has difficulty in school because of substance abuse.	18	02	10	00	04	40	04	00	22
makes inappropriate sexual comments.	04	02	06	38	00	36	02	10	02
is responsible for negative or disruptive behavior in the classroom.	00	18	22	00	04	38	02	16	00
uses any and all behaviors to receive attention.	10	04	04	38	02	32	04	04	02
is provoked to fight by a classmate.	00	02	00	00	22	14	00	26	36
feels powerless.	08	34	02	08	02	18	26	00	02
acts immaturely with classmates.	04	00	08	22	08	28	00	12	18
is in a crowded unstructured environment.	18	04	30	12	04	26	02	00	04
doesn't see the reward for good social skills.	26	22	30	12	02	02	02	02	02
must deal with parents' divorce.	26	08	02	16	16	06	26	00	00

*Level of agreement expressed in %s.

** OT- Other
RA-Response to Authority
CE-Classroom Expectations
CO-Communicating With Others
NB-Negative Behaviors From Others
SC-Self Control
RJ-Rejection
PV-Provoking Peers
PP-Peer Pressure

Table 5

Junior High Critical Social Task Taxonomy

PEER PRESSURE	REJECTION
When a student is offered drugs or alcohol.	When a student is rejected by classmates.
When a student is expected to act tough towards other kids.	When a student feels insecure with or is unwelcomed by classmates.
When a student is pressured by classmates to get into trouble.	When a student doesn't fit in with classmates.
COMMUNICATING WITH OTHERS	PROVOKES PEERS
When a student can't identify and verbalize feelings.	When a student constantly criticizes classmates.
When a student doesn't know how to ask for help.	When a student "picks on" a classmate.
SELF-CONTROL	NEGATIVE BEHAVIOR FROM OTHERS
When a student's temper is not controlled.	When a student is hit by someone.
When a student responds to a frustrating situation immaturely (temper tantrum, whining, verbal abuse).	When a student has a possession destroyed.
When a student gets angry.	When a student is teased by a classmate.
When a student carries anger from an earlier confrontation to other situations.	When a student has to deal with bullies or abusive behavior.

APPENDIX E

CROSS-VALIDATING A LIST OF PROBLEMATIC SOCIAL TASKS

Cross-Validating a List of Problematic Social Tasks

The purpose of this study was two-fold: first, to validate the ability of the Social Task List (STL) (Neel, Meadows & Scott, 1990), to discriminate between socially competent and socially incompetent students; second, to examine the level of agreement between the newly developed STL and the Walker-McConnell Scale of Social Competence (WMC) (Walker & McConnell, 1988). The WMC is an established scale used to assess teacher estimates of student's social competence and school adjustment. The WMC utilizes two versions, an elementary and an adolescent version, to assess teacher estimates of social competence. Both versions were used in this study. Such scales have been shown to be very reliable in determining childrens' overall social competence (Dodge, 1986; Ladd, 1985; Putallaz and Gattman, 1981).

The Walker McConnell Scale reliably discriminates socially competent from incompetent children. However, it was not developed to identify specific social tasks and their task-specific social skill requirements. Therefore, it does not provide the type of information which might prove useful in developing appropriate intervention programs. It is believed that the Social Task List (STL) developed previously in this research will provide the basis for specific intervention programs. The WMC's ability to reliably discriminate competent from socially incompetent children makes it a good comparative standard measure for initial field tests of the Social Task List.

METHOD

Subjects. Special education directors from school districts in Washington and Colorado solicited volunteers from among the upper elementary and junior high school teachers of the seriously behaviorally disordered (SBD) in their districts. Subjects were recruited from urban, suburban and rural schools, but were not randomly selected and thus constitute a volunteer sample. The special education teachers who agreed to participate were asked to nominate a general education teacher. The participating teachers then contacted the parents of their students for consent. Teachers then completed both the STL and the WMC (either the adolescent or the elementary version) on all of those students for whom consent had been received.

The subject pool comprised a total of 247 students rated by 24 teachers. The student pool included the following groups:

- 49 special education students of the junior high school level
- 55 general education students from the junior high school level
- 54 special education students from the upper elementary school level
- 87 regular education students from the upper elementary school level

Students identified as having serious behavior disorders were so classified according to their individual state's regulations and criteria.

INSTRUMENTATION

The Walker-McConnell Social Skills Survey (WMC -- both the elementary and the adolescent versions) and the Social Task List (STL -- both the elementary and the adolescent aged versions) were used to collect data in this study. The WMC adolescent social skills survey (Walker et al, 1988) contains 48 positively worded items that describe teacher to peer) and peer to peer behavioral adjustment competencies. The scales provides the rater a 5-point Likert frequency rating that from "never" to "frequently". The skills listed in the survey were designed to provide information regarding four behavioral domains considered to be important to adolescent development: section 1, self control (12 items); section 2, peer relations (20 items); section 3, school adjustment (10 items); section 4, empathy (6 items).

The elementary version of the WMC survey consists of 43 positively worded items again to be rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "never" to "frequently". this version of the scale consists of three subscales which measure three behavioral domains: subscale 1, teacher-preferred behaviors (16 items); subscale 2, peer preferred behaviors (17 items); subscale 3, social adjustment behaviors (10 items). the Social Task List (STL) was also used in two versions, an elementary and an adolescent aged version. The elementary version of the STL is comprised of 34 items, the adolescent version is comprised of 41 items. Both versions present a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "no problem" to "significant problem". The scale was used to rate situations judged by professionals and students to present problems for socially incompetent children. For a more complete description of the STL, see Neel, Meadows, Scott, 1990).

PROCEDURE

Following the receipt of informed consent, each child was assessed by his/her teacher using the age appropriate versions of both the WMC and the STL. In order to assess the level of agreement between scores on the two assessment devices (Research Question 1) Pearson Product moment correlations were run on the scores from both surveys. T-tests were used to discover if there was a significant difference between the general education students and the special education students on their total MMC scores and their total STL scores (Research Question 2). In order to test the STL's ability to reliably discriminate between socially competent and socially incompetent students (Research Question 3), Discriminant Analyses were run on the Student's STL scores.

RESULTS

1. *What is the level of agreement between the two assessment devices?*

For elementary aged general education students (E-GES) the level of agreement between scores on the two assessment devices was significant at the .001 level. This was true for all three subtests as well as for the total WMC score.

For the elementary aged special education students (E-SES) one significant correlation was revealed to exist between the scores on the STL and subtest one of the WMC. Correlations between the STL and subtests 2 and 3 as well as between the STL and the total WMC score were found to be not significant.

Table 1a

Correlations between upper elementary students scores
on the social task list (STL) and the Walker McConnell
subtests and total score

	Subtest 1	Subtest 2	Subtest 3	Total
General Education Students	0.7848**	0.3685**	0.6325**	0.6622**
Special Education Students	0.6545**	0.0491	0.2526	0.2993

For the junior high school general education students (J-GES) the level of agreement between scores on the two assessment devices was significant at the 0.001 level. This was true for all four subsets, as well as for the total WMC score.

For the junior high aged special education students (J-SES) one significant correlation was revealed between the score on the STL and subtest one of the WMC. Correlations between the STL score and scores on subtests 2, 3, 4 and the total WMC score were non significant.

Table 1b

Correlations between junior high student scores
on the social task list and the Walker McConnell subtests
and total score

	Subtest 1	Subtest 2	Subtest 3	Subtest 4	Total
General Education Students	0.7889**	0.4722**	0.4839**	0.4890**	0.6248**
Special Education Students	0.4602**	0.0842	0.2151	0.0969	0.2844

2. *Were there significant differences between general education students and special education students on their total WMC and their total STL scores?*

T-test run on the students' mean scores on the STL and on the WMC indicate that there were significant differences between the general education students and the special education students.

Table 2a

Means and standard Deviation for Elementary Aged Students

on the STL and the WMC Subtests and total score

	General Education Students		Special Education Students	
Variable	X	SD	X	SD
STL	44.056	20.180	81.944	24.375
Total WMC	175.112	27.688	126.463	28.816
Subtest 1	63.180	11.423	44.611	11.067
Subtest 2	68.472	12.435	51.426	15.078
Subtest 3	43.461	7.419	30.426	8.399

Table 2b

Means and Standard Deviations for Junior High Students on the STL and the WMC subtests and total scores

	General Education Students		Special Education Students	
Variable	X	SD	X	SD
STL	57.436	16.417	98.592	27.038
Total WMC	172.855	34.652	127.720	21.946
Subtest 1	44.145	9.015	31.180	7.131
Subtest 2	69.836	14.590	55.640	11.563
Subtest 3	38.891	10.343	25.960	7.666
Subtest 4	19.982	5.359	14.940	3.733

Table 3

T-test (pooled variance estimate) for the junior and upper elementary school students

	Upper Elementary	Junior High
STL	$t = 10.05$ $df = 141$ $p < 0.001$	$t = 9.50$ $df = 102$ $p < 0.0001$
WMC	$t = -10.03$ $df = 141$ $p < 0.001$	$t = -7.88$ $df = 103$ $p < 0.0001$

3. *Is the Social Task List able to discriminate between those students labelled SES and those labelled GES?*

Discriminate Analyses were conducted to investigate this question. The results of the discriminant analyses indicate that the STL is able to discriminate between the two groups (SES and GES students). In the case of the elementary aged students, the STL was able to correctly classify the students as wither general or special education in 79.7% of the cases. In the case of the junior high school students, the STL was able to correctly classify the students as special or as general education in 77.9% of the cases.

Table 4

Discriminant Analysis used to test the STL's Ability to discriminate between special education students and general education students

			Predicted Group	
	Actual Group	# of Cases	SES	GES
Elementary students	SES	54	42 (77.8%)	12 (22.2%)
	GES	89	17 (19.1%)	72 (80.9%)
	% of elementary students correctly classified 79.7%			
Junior High	SES	49	36 (73.5%)	13 (26.5%)
	GES	55	10 (18.2%)	45 (81.8%)
	% of junior high students correctly classified 77.88%			

DISCUSSION

This study was designed to examine the Social Task List's ability to discriminate between socially competent and socially incompetent students. Basically, this question was addressed in two ways. First, the STL was compared to an existing tool (the WMC) that has been shown to be reliable in discriminating between the two groups of students. Secondly, discriminant analyses were performed on the data collected in this study. Overall, the results of the study indicate that STL is able to discriminate between socially competent and socially incompetent students.

The comparison between the STL and the WMC revealed a different pattern for special education students than for the general education. More variability existed in the special education population on both measures. For the general education students, the level of agreement between the STL and the WMC was significant at the 0.001 level. However, for the special education students only one correlation, that between the STL and subtest 1 or the WMC (Teacher preferred - self control behaviors) was significant.

References

Dodge, K. (1986). A social information processing model of social competence in children. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), Minnesota Symposium in Child Psycholog, (Vol. 8, pp. 77-125). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ladd, S. (1985). In B. H. Schneider, K. H. Rubin, & J. E. Ledingham (Eds.), Children's peer relations: Issues in assessment and intervention. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Neel, R. S., Meadows, N. B., & Scott, C. M. (1990). Determining social tasks: A preliminary report. Monograph in Behavioral Disorders: Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth (Vol. 13). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Putallaz, M., & Gottman, J. M. (1981). An interactional model of children's entry into peer groups. Child Development, 52, 986-994.

Walker, H. M. & McConnell, S. R. (1988). The Walker-McConnell Scale of Social Competence and School Adjustment. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

APPENDIX F

A VALIDATION OF SOCIAL SKILLS FOR STUDENTS WITH BEHAVIOR DISORDERS

A Validation of Social Skills for Students with Behavioral Disorders

Nancy Meadows, Richard S. Neel, Gerilyn Parker, and Kimberly Timo

ABSTRACT

Secondary students with behavioral disorders, regular education secondary students, secondary teachers of students with behavioral disorders, regular education secondary teachers, and parents of both student populations from the states of Washington, Iowa, and Colorado were asked to complete the Adolescent Social Skills Survey (Walker, Todis, Holmes, & Horton, 1988). The survey consists of 48 items about how adolescents relate to themselves, to other adolescents, and to adults. Overall, all groups thought all items on the survey were important. As a group, students with serious behavioral disorders rated interpersonal skills higher than other skills on the survey; However, these same students consistently rated all items lower. These students also rated compliance and cooperation skills as less important than the two teacher groups. Discussion centers around the implications these results have on programing for seriously behaviorally disordered students, with future needs being directed toward developing a functionally valid list of critical social skills.

Since the enactment of Public Law 94-142 and its mandate of "least restrictive environment," exceptional students have been mainstreamed into regular classrooms in greater numbers than ever before. Unfortunately, the physical placement of mildly handicapped children in the presence of their nonhandicapped peers has not resulted in mutual social interaction and acceptance between the two groups (Gresham, 1982; Sabornie, 1985). Research has shown that all handicapped students do not have the appropriate social skills to succeed in mainstream situations nor do they acquire the necessary social skills by modeling their nonhandicapped peers (Asher & Hymel, 1981; Cartledge, Frew, & Zaharias, 1985; Gresham, 1981, 1982). Moreover, studies have demonstrated that there are typically low rates of social interaction between mainstreamed handicapped children and their classmates (Bruininks, 1978; Gresham, 1981; Morgan, 1977).

For students with serious behavioral disorders, social skill deficiencies may be the most critical deterrent to social acceptance (Schloss, Schloss, Wood, & Kiehl, 1986). By definition, these students are set apart by their lack of social competence. Numerous studies have indicated that (a) students with behavioral disorders lack appropriate social skills (Gresham, 1982, 1986; Kauffman, 1989); (b) many students with behavior problems are poorly accepted by their peers (Asher & Hymel, 1981; Asher & Taylor, 1983; Gresham, 1986; Michelson & Wood, 1980; Sabornie, 1985); and (c) many students with behavioral disorders are rated by their teachers as having inadequate social skills (Gresham, 1982, 1986). These findings indicate that, prior to placing seriously behaviorally disordered students in mainstream classes, educators need to look more closely at students' specific social skills deficits and their levels of social competency.

It has been well documented in the literature that social skills have an important relationship to all aspects of students' lives: educational, social, and employment (Combs & Slaby, 1977; Gronlund & Anderson, 1962; Michelson & Wood, 1980; Roff, Sells, & Golden, 1972; Ullman, 1957). Furthermore, problems in these areas have long lasting effects. Adults who have documented social deficits as children are reported to have psychological problems (Gottman, Gonso, & Schuler, 1976; Sheperd, 1980), unsuccessful employment histories (Knold, 1985; Neel, Meadows, Levine, & Edgar, 1988), negative military service records (Roff, 1970), and increased incidences of suicide (Stengel, 1973). Psychologists, employers, and educators agree that early intervention should occur within the school setting in an attempt to counteract these problems (Gottman et al., 1976; Knold, 1985; Roff, 1970; Roff et al., 1972; Sheperd, 1980).

Investigation of current instruction of social skills has provided mixed results, indicating that new social behaviors may be learned but they do not generalize across a variety of social situations and do not maintain after intervention is terminated (Bellack, 1983; McConnell, 1987). Social skills training programs have not produced behavioral changes that make handicapped children more socially acceptable (Kauffman, 1989).

One of the reasons suggested for the lack of success of social skills programs is that the skills targeted for instruction may not be those which will lead to positive social exchanges. As Kauffman (1989) states, "The goal of intervention must be to help the socially isolated individual become enmeshed or entrapped in positive, reciprocal, self-perpetuating social exchanges, which can be done only by carefully choosing the target skills" (p. 336). Target skills must relate to peers or other important people in the environment (teacher, parents, other adults) where they will encounter naturally occurring prompts and reinforcers (McConnell, 1987). It is important to teach skills that are valued not only by the individual student but also by others in her/his environment.

The social skills currently targeted for instruction may not be those which are socially valid for students. Current social skills programs have focused on those skills which adults, not students themselves, have judged important (Kazdin & Matson, 1981; LeCroy, 1983). As a result, socially incompetent students may not increase their levels of social acceptance even if specific skills are mastered.

Kazdin and Matson (1981) have suggested subjective evaluation as one method for establishing the validity of training targets. This involves obtaining feedback from significant others to establish social significance of target behaviors. If the social skill acquired is not valued by others in the learner's environment, social competence in those settings will not be increased. The identification of functional social skills — skills which will increase a child's competence in the classroom, with peers, with teachers, and with other adults — is urgently needed.

The purpose of this study was to take a closer look at the social skills which have been targeted for intervention and to determine if the particular needs of seriously behaviorally disordered students have been addressed. Extending the work of Williams, Walker, Holmes, Todis, and Fabre (1989) to validate the social skills included in the ACCESS program for instructing social skills, this study identified the sets of social skills valued by teachers, parents, peers, and the seriously behaviorally disordered students in various school environments. The following research questions were posed:

1. Which skills identified by the Survey of Adolescent Social Skills (Williams et al., 1989) were rated as important by regular education teachers, teachers of students with behavioral disorders, regular education students, students with behavioral disorders, regular education parents, and parents of students with behavioral disorders?
2. Were there differences in the rank ordering of these skills in terms of their importance to each group?
3. What were the specific differences among the groups with regard to how they rated the specific social skill?

METHOD

Subjects

Special education directors from school districts in Washington, Iowa, and Colorado solicited volunteers from among the upper elementary and junior high (grades 4-9) teachers of the seriously behaviorally disordered in their districts. Subjects were recruited from urban, suburban, and rural schools but were not randomly selected and thus do not constitute a nonvolunteer sample. Generalizations regarding the results of this study are limited to teachers who may choose to volunteer for such tasks. The special education teachers who agreed to participate were asked to nominate a regular education teacher. The participating teachers then each nominated a student, contacted the parents of their students for consent, and distributed the surveys to parents and those students for whom they had received consent. Students who participated were from upper elementary and junior high school grades (grades 4-9)

The subject pool was comprised of a total of 383 subjects and included the following six groups: 70 regular education students (RES), 69 students with behavioral disorders (SES), 80 teachers of students with behavioral disorders (SET), 76 regular education teachers (RET), 54 parents of regular education students (REP), and 33 parents of students with behavioral disorders (SEP). Students identified as having serious behavioral disorders were so classified according to their individual states' regulations and criteria. Because state regulations and criteria vary across states, generalizations regarding the special education student data may be limited.

Instrumentation

The Adolescent Social Skills Survey (Walker et al., 1988) containing 48 items was used to collect the data. A 5-point Likert scale was provided for the subjects' use in rating the importance of each skill. The skills listed in the survey were designed to provide information regarding three behavioral domains considered to be important to adolescent adjustment.

1. Relating to others — This domain involves skills which are needed to relate to peers, co-workers, and/or other students and to develop friendships and social support networks.
2. Relating to adults — This domain includes skills needed to relate to teachers, employers, and/or parents and to behave in ways which meet adult expectations for compliance and performance.
3. Relating to self — This domain examines those skills which allow the individual to independently and effectively manage her/his life.

There were 23 skills included in section 1 (relating to others), 9 skills in section 2 (relating to adults), and 16 skills in section 3 (relating to self). The items under each section were randomly distributed to control for item presentation or sequence effects. Three versions of the survey were generated in this manner and randomly distributed to subjects. Blank spaces were provided at the end of each section for respondents to include any additional skills they felt to be important.

Test-retest reliability had been previously reported (Timo, 1988) and ranged from .92 to .56 for all but one section. The test-retest reliability was low (.21) for special education teachers in the relating-to-others section. Williams et al. (1989) reported estimates of internal consistency (split-half reliability) for students and teachers at .96.

Procedures

Teachers, students, and parents from Washington, Colorado, and Iowa were asked to complete the survey of adolescent social skills developed by Walker and his colleagues at the University of Oregon. There were three versions of the survey, all containing identical items but arranged in differing order. Versions 1, 2, and 3 were randomly distributed to subjects. All students were given the survey after verbal instructions and asked to return them to their teachers. Any student who needed assistance in reading or interpreting an item was given the necessary help. The surveys were distributed and collected over two school years, 1987-1988 and 1988-1989.

In order to assess the importance of the skills in this survey (Research Question 1), mean scores were calculated for each group on each item (see Table 1). Spearman rank order correlations were calculated in order to assess the rank order agreement within the three adjustment domains sampled by the survey (Research Question 2). Correlations were computed using the mean scores and item rankings by section. Spearman rank order correlations were chosen because the data were ordinal and Spearman rank order correlations provided the most conservative representation of the data. In an effort to determine the specific differences among the groups regarding their opinions on specific social skills (Research Question 3), chi-square analyses were computed. Chi-square analyses were chosen because the data were ordinal (and as such did not fulfill the basic assumptions of analysis of variance). In addition, chi-square analyses allow for an examination of differences among sets of groups.

RESULTS

Question 1: Are the social skills on this survey perceived as important by teachers, students, and parents?

As 4 was defined as *Important* and 5 as *Very Important*, items with mean scores of 4.0 or above were determined to be perceived by the groups as important. Overall, teachers, students, and parents viewed the skills on this survey as important social skills. Both parent groups (REP and SEP) as well as the regular education teachers and students (RET and RES) rated at least 43 of the 48 skills (90%) as important (having a mean above 4.0) to adolescent social success.

Table 1 lists the frequency of items at various ranges of means by section. In section 1 (getting along with others) the majority of items received a score of 4.0 or higher from all six groups. However, the percentage was slightly lower for the special education students and teachers (SES and SET), each of whom rated 18 out of 23 (78%) items as important.

In section 2 (getting along with adults) the same basic pattern persists. Five of the six groups (RES, REP, SEP, RET, SET) rated all but one skill as important. All five groups indicated that the same skill – being of assistance to the teacher – was the only skill included on the list that was not critical. Students with behavioral disorders (SES) indicated that three of the nine skills were not critical to getting along with adults.

In section 3 (getting along with yourself) all of the skills were rated at 4.0 or above by all of the groups except special education teachers (SET) who rated 14 out of the 16 skills (87%) as important.

TABLE 1

List of means above 4.0

	SES	RES	SET	RET	SEP	REP
Section 1 - Relating to others (23 items)						
4.5 - 5.0	1	2	4	6	11	5
4.25 - 4.49	2	10	7	9	7	7
4.0 - 4.24	15	10	7	6	4	7
Less than 4.0	5	1	5	2	1	4
Section 2 - Relating to adults (9 items)						
4.5 - 5.0	0	1	0	2	4	2
4.25 - 4.49	0	3	6	5	4	3
4.0 - 4.24	6	4	2	1	0	3
Less than 4.0	3	1	1	1	1	1
Section 3 - Relating to self (16 items)						
4.5 - 5.0	0	4	6	8	7	6
4.25 - 4.49	4	7	6	6	8	5
4.0 - 4.24	12	5	2	2	1	5
Less than 4.0	0	0	2	0	0	0

Question 2: Were there differences in the rank ordering of these skills in terms of their importance to each group?

Results are summarized in Table 2. Correlation coefficients indicated a moderate ($p <$ .05) or high ($p <$ .01) agreement between the parents and teachers of both special and regular education students (REP/RET; SEP/SET). The agreement level between the two student groups (RES and SES) was moderate or high (section 1 = .76, section 2 = .78, section 3 = .62). Scores from students with behavioral disorders (SES) had only moderate agreement with the adult groups (SES/RET; SES/SEP; SES/SET). Correlations for regular education students (RES) with the adult groups were somewhat higher.

TABLE 2

Spearman Rank Correlations

Groups	REP RES	REP RET	RES RET	RES SES	RES SET	RET SES	RET SET	SEP SES	SET SES	SEP SET
Relating to others Section 1	.52**	.91**	.48*	.76**	.39*	.40*	.90**	.35*	.33	.62**
Relating to adults Section 2	.77*	.77*	.47	.78*	.48	.36	.67*	.32	.23	.73*
Relating to self Section 3	.65**	.88**	.58*	.62**	.60*	.29	.82**	.36	.17	.71**

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$

Question 3: What are the specific differences among the groups regarding their opinions on specific social skills?

Section 1. Results of the chi-square analyses are summarized in Table 3. The special education students (SES) differed from the special education teachers (SET) on three items: Be Responsible, Express Anger the Right Way, and Handle Aggression. In each case, the teachers rated the skills higher. Special education students differed from regular education teachers (RET) on seven items. In each case, teachers indicated that the skills were more important. The only item in section 1 on which a significant difference occurred between the two student groups (RES, SES) was Be Considerate. Regular education students placed a higher value on this skill.

Section 2. Significant differences in the rating of the item Be of Assistance to the Teacher were observed in six of the ten group analyses. Both student groups and the parents of students with behavioral disorders indicated that Being of Assistance to the Teacher was more important than did either teacher group or the regular education parent group. The regular education teachers differed from both student groups in placing a higher value on the development of independent study skills. Special education students differed from both regular and special education teachers in placing a lesser value on Following Classroom Rules. Students with behavioral disorders also placed a lesser value on Disagreeing with Adults in an Acceptable Manner than did their parents, teachers, their regular education peers, and regular education teachers.

Section 3. In this section, students with behavioral disorders differed from both teacher groups on a number of items. They (SES) differed from special education teachers on the following skills: Be Honest, Accept Consequences, and Look Good. They (SES) differed from regular education teachers on those three items and also on Have Standards for Own Behavior, Do What You Say You'll Do, and Self-Control. The special education students placed a greater emphasis on Looking Good and Feel Good About Self. The teachers (SET, RET) placed greater emphasis on Have Standards for Own Behavior, Be Honest, Accept Consequences, Do What You Say You'll Do, and Self-Control. Special education students differed from their parents in that they placed a lower value on Accepting Consequences, Being Honest, and Having Standards for Own Behavior. The item Looking Good was consistently more important to students than to adults.

TABLE 3

Chi Square Analyses

Group	Item	x 2	Level of Significance	Rated Higher
Section 1 - Relating to others				
RES/RET	Be responsible	20.96	.00001	RET
	Aggression	13.30	.0013	RET
RES/SES	Be considerate	14.35	.0008	RES
RES/SET	Be responsible	13.35	.0013	SET
	Aggression	19.18	.0001	SET
RET/SES	Be considerate	15.88	.0004	RET
	Be responsible	30.97	.00001	RET
	Pressure	29.87	.00001	RET
	Aggression	21.85	.00001	RET
	Rejection	17.90	.0001	RET
	Ask for assistance	16.66	.0002	RET
	Listen	13.48	.0012	RET
SEP/SES	Permission	14.56	.0007	SEP
	Responsible	14.40	.0007	SEP
	Pressure	20.06	.00001	SEP
	Aggression	15.15	.0005	SEP
SET/SES	Responsible	23.81	.00001	SET
	Express	13.99	.0009	SET
	Aggression	27.54	.00001	SET
Section 2 - Relating to adults				
RES/RET	Assist teacher	17.17	.0002	RES
	Develop independent study skills	14.18	.0008	RET
RES/SET	Assist teacher	24.49	.00001	RES
RET/SES	Assist teacher	29.47	.00001	SES
	Develop independent study skills	19.99	.00001	RET
	Disagree	16.96	.0002	RET
	Follow classroom rules	17.81	.0001	RET
	Avoid confrontations	17.22	.0002	RET
SEP/SES	Develop independent study skills	12.48	.0019	SEP
SET/SES	Assist teacher	29.16	.00001	SES
	Disagree	22.48	.00001	SET
	Follow classroom rules	13.92	.0009	SET
SEP/SET	Assist teacher	24.31	.00001	SEP
Section 3 - Relating to self				
REP/RES	Look good	15.50	.0004	RES
RES/RET	Set goals	16.92	.0002	RET
	Look good	25.15	.00001	RES
RES/SET	Set goals	13.48	.0012	SET
	Look good	21.48	.00001	RES
RET/SES	Be honest	24.50	.00001	RET
	Have standards	15.87	.0004	RET
	Accept consequence	35.97	.00001	RET
	Look good	27.53	.00001	SES
	Do what you say	16.02	.0003	RET
	Have self-control	16.57	.0003	RET
SEP/SES	Be honest	18.26	.0001	SEP
	Accept consequence	14.25	.0008	SEP
SET/SES	Be honest	14.39	.0008	SET
	Accept consequence	31.10	.00001	SET
	Look good	24.07	.00001	SES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DISCUSSION

This study was designed to examine the opinions of students, teachers, and parents regarding adolescent social skills and to understand what, if any, differences existed among the groups. Overall, the participants in this study viewed a majority of the skills surveyed as important, supporting the conclusions made by Williams et al. (1989). There were, however, some differences between groups which merit discussion, especially with regard to programing for seriously behaviorally disordered students.

Students with behavioral disorders did not feel that skills such as Being of Assistance to the Teacher, Avoiding Confrontations and Problems with Adults, and Disagreeing with Adults in an Acceptable Way were as critical as other skills. This is a direct contradiction of the high value that regular and special education teachers have placed on behaviors that demonstrate compliance and cooperation, both in this study and in others reported in the literature (Cartledge et al., 1985; Kerr & Zigmond, 1986).

Regular education students rated adult oriented skills such as Being Considerate more highly than did special education students. This difference may be the result of actual differences between the values of the two student groups. It is quite possible that the regular education students, those in the mainstream, have become proficient at fulfilling the expectations of the school system. Cairns (1986) suggests that people tend to perform their habitual responses in reoccurring situations. In this way, social systems are reinforced and maintained. Students with behavioral disorders may not feel such a part of the adult oriented school system. As a result, they might be less interested in performing those skills valued by adults.

It is important to note that students with behavior problems may find themselves in trouble with adults for lacking the very skills that they indicated are not a priority to them. It seems quite significant that this group, alone out of the six, placed a lower value on getting along with adults. Why did the students with behavioral disorders indicate they did not place as high a value on these skills as did the other five groups? Gresham (1986) provides a conceptualization of social competency which may shed some light on this issue. He makes a distinction between skill deficits and performance deficits. The basis of the distinction rests on whether or not the student knows how to perform the skill in question. Gresham (1986) posits that a lack of motivation may be one underlying cause for social skill performance deficits. If this is true, students may not be motivated to perform these skills because the rewards are not great enough or because the skills do not meet their needs.

The issue of social significance should play a major part in the design and implementation of behavioral interventions. The social significance of a particular skill is usually based on the subjective judgments of relevant others in the students' environment (Gresham, 1986; Kazdin, 1977). Responses from teachers in this study have indicated that certain skills are necessary for success, at least in the academic environment. It becomes imperative, then, to understand why students with behavioral disorders do not value and perform these skills. The answer to such fundamental questions might determine how one approaches these skills in a training program. One caution, however, must be raised. Since the reported reliability of special education teachers was low, further investigations regarding their perceptions should be conducted.

As expected, both teacher groups placed the greatest importance on those skills that would aid in the smooth running of the classroom. Both teacher groups focused on compliance skills such as accepting consequences and following directions as major requirements for their students. Independent study skills and following classroom rules without undue supervision were also valued by both teacher groups. These responses are consistent with other research which has indicated that teachers place the highest value on adaptive behaviors that ensure a smooth running classroom (Calkins et al., 1984; Cartledge et al., 1985; Walker, 1984; Walker & Rankin, 1983).

There were, however, differences between the two groups of teachers. For example, special education teachers placed greater emphasis on Expressing Anger the Right Way and on Disagreeing with Adults in an Acceptable Way than did regular education teachers. This difference may reflect the different populations that they serve.

Regular education teachers also felt it was important for students to have standards for their own behavior. It could be very important for teachers of students with behavioral disorders to encourage their students to start to develop standards for their behavior that reflect those of general education students. It also seems imperative that they develop a set of independent behaviors that will enable them to plan their activities and monitor their progress and behavior. The work of Lloyd and his colleagues (1989) in the area of self-management offers several suggestions for planners of social skills programs.

Another interesting finding of this study is the lack of concordance of the values expressed by the children with behavioral disorders and all other groups. With a data set that is so similar across groups, the lack of correlation between the findings for this group and the others is noteworthy. A review of Table 2 shows that a majority of their ratings are discordant with the other groups studied. This is especially true in section 2, relating to adults. A functional approach to analyzing behavior suggests that chains of behavior produce an effect (Neel, 1984). The success or failure does not depend on its acceptance by others, but its ability to produce a desired result. Using this framework, social skills are viewed as a set of (or series of) behaviors required to achieve a social goal in a particular situation (Neel, Meadows, & Scott, 1990). If we were to assume a functional approach to analyzing social skills, it would seem that a major component in the training of social skills would have to be teaching children with behavioral disorders to value interacting with adults. This may require a restructuring of the methods for delivering services that we now use (Neel & Cessna, 1990; Neel, Cessna, Swize, & Borock, 1988).

If one of the major goals of a social skills training program is to prepare students for reentry into the general education classroom, then it seems critical to examine the priorities of the teachers of those classrooms, who have shown themselves to be highly oppositional to the behavior of many mainstreamed children (Sarason & Doris, 1978). The perception of general education teachers is an important one. When teachers design programs to teach children with behavioral disorders those skills required to integrate effectively into general education environments, they should be aware of the skills which are highly valued by regular education teachers and students.

It is also not surprising that students prefer immediate social goals to those with more long-term indirect payoffs. In fact, the degree to which students and teachers agree might be considered a measure of socialization toward adult values. Again as expected, the ratings of general education students on social skill items correspond more closely to the adults than did the ratings of children with behavioral disorders. These findings, though not unexpected, do accent the need for inclusion of training of skills required by youth to become successful with their peers and adults.

The data in this study, however, also show that there is another set of skills that are critical to the social success of children with behavioral disorders: those that effect short term peer adjustment. In fact, these latter skills have a greater value for students than those most valued by their teachers or parents. The need to develop effective training programs to address these skills can no longer be ignored. If school programs are going to be able to meet the needs of all their students, they will have to realign their priorities to include peer focused social skills training (Neel, Cessna et al., 1988).

CONCLUSION

The results of this study indicate that parents, students, and teachers viewed the 48 skills on this survey as important. However, it must be remembered that the participants in this study were subjected to a *forced choice* condition. They were provided a prechosen list of skills and asked to rate their importance. This limits the degree to which the data may be generalized. While it is true that this study and others like it (Timo, 1988; Williams et al., 1989) have shown these skills to be important, they have not proven them to be critical. Subjects in this study were only asked to react to a fixed set of skills. Having groups of people generate their own lists of skills may produce different skills. Further research needs to be done that will determine which of these skills are critical to successful integration.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Despite the possibly limiting effects mentioned above, understanding the differences among the groups in this study will begin to increase understanding of why social skills training programs do not work as well as expected. If it is true that many of the social skills included in training programs were chosen on the basis of face validity (Kazdin & Matson, 1981), then this kind of empirical testing is one way to understand which skills will be valued and reinforced. Skills that are not considered valuable by students, and those who work and live with them, have less chance of becoming a functional part of the student's behavior (McConnell, 1987).

Because the goal of many social skills training programs is to have the students return to the mainstream classroom, the differences between regular education teachers and special education students should be considered carefully. More significant differences occurred between these two groups than any other possible combination. In order for students, especially students with behavioral disorders, to benefit from social skills training programs, the skills they learn must be important to them and to the many other people with whom they interact. Students and adults need to be aware of their own and each other's values. This study is just a beginning in the effort to understand which skills are critical and why.

Future research needs to be directed towards developing a functionally valid list of critical social skills. It seems quite possible that if this many differences exist under a forced choice condition, even more differences in values and priorities might be revealed under different experimental conditions. It is essential that future training programs include skills that will make functional differences in students' behavior and in the judgments of those who come in contact with them.

REFERENCES

Asher, S. R., & Hymel, S. (1981). Children's social competence in peer relations: Sociometric and behavioral assessment. In J. D. Wine & M. D. Syme (Eds.), *Social competence* (pp. 125-157). New York: Guilford Press.

Asher, S. R., & Taylor, A. R. (1983). Social skill training with children: Evaluating processes and outcomes. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 8*, 237-245.

Bellack, A. S. (1983). Recurrent problems in the behavioral assessment of social skill. *Behavioral Research Therapy, 21(1)*, 29-41.

Bruininks, V. L. (1978). Actual and perceived peer status of learning disabled students in mainstream programs. *Journal of Special Education, 12*, 51-58.

Cairns, R. B. (1986). A contemporary perspective on social development. In P. S. Strain, M. J. Guralnick, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), *Children's social behavior: Development assessment and modification* (pp. 3-47). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Calkins, C. F., Walker, H. M., Bacon-Prue, A., Gibson, B. A., Martinson, M., Offner, R., & Intagliata, J. (1984). *The learning and adjustment process*. Kansas City: University of Missouri, Institute for Human Development.

Cartledge, G., Frew, T., & Zaharias, J. (1985). Social skill needs of mainstreamed students: Peer and teacher perceptions. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 8*, 132-139.

Combs, M. L., & Slaby, D. A. (1977). Social skills training with children. In B. B. Lahey & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), *Advances in child clinical psychology* (Vol 1, pp. 39-60). New York: Plenum.

Gottman, J., Gonso, J., & Schuler, P. (1976). Teaching social skills to isolated children. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 4*, 179-197.

Gresham, F. M. (1981). Social skills training with handicapped children: A review. *Review of Educational Research, 51(1)*, 139-176.

Gresham, F. M. (1982). Misguided mainstreaming: The case for social skills training with handicapped children. *Exceptional Children, 49*, 49-54.

Gresham, F. M. (1986). Conceptual issues in the assessment of social competence in children. In P.S. Strain, M. J. Guralnick, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), *Children's social behavior: Development, assessment, and modification* (pp. 143-179). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Gronlund, H., & Anderson, L. (1962). Personality characteristics of socially accepted, socially neglected, and socially rejected junior high school pupils. In J. Sedeman (Ed.), *Educating for mental health* (pp. 162-173). New York: Cromwell.

Kauffman, J. M. (1989). *Characteristics of behavior disorders of children and youth* (4th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Kazdin, A. E. (1977). Assessing the clinical or applied importance of behavior change through social

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

validation. *Behavior Modification, 1,* 427-452.

Kazdin, A. E., & Matson, J. L. (1981). Social validation in mental retardation. *Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 2,* 39-53.

Kerr, M., & Zigmond, N. (1986). What do high school teachers want? A study of expectations and standards. *Education and Treatment of Children, 9,* 239-249.

Knold, J. A. (Ed.). (1985). *Employee training needs as expressed by employers in Washington state.* Olympia: Washington State Commission for Vocational Education.

LeCroy, C. W. (1983). Social skills training with adolescents: A review. *Child and Youth Services, 5,* 91-116.

Lloyd, J. W., Landrum, T. J., & Hallahan, D. P. (1989). *Self-monitoring applications for classroom intervention* (Virginia Behavior Disorders Project, Research Report No. 8). Charlottesville: University of Virginia.

McConnell, S. R. (1987). Entrapment effects and the generalization and maintenance of social skills training for elementary school students with behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 12,* 252-263.

Michelson, L., & Wood, R. (1980). Behavioral assessment and training of children's social skills. *Progress in Behavior Modification, 9,* 241-291.

Morgan, S. R. (1977). A descriptive analysis of maladjusted behavior in socially rejected children. *Behavioral Disorders, 3,* 23-30.

Neel, R. S. (1984). Teaching social routines to behaviorally disordered youth. In C. R. Smith & E. McGinnis (Eds.), *Educational instruments in behavioral disorders* (pp. 88-73). Des Moines: Iowa State Department of Education.

Neel, R. S., & Cessna, K. K. (1990). *Do these behaviors make sense?* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Neel, R. S., Cessna, K., Swize, M., & Borock, J. (1988). *Position paper on serving S.I.E.B.D. students.* Unpublished manuscript, Colorado State Department of Education, Denver.

Neel, R. S., Meadows, N. B., Levine, P., & Edgar, E. B. (1988). What happens after special education: A statewide follow-up study of secondary students who have behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 13,* 209-216.

Neel, R. S., Meadows, N. B., & Scott, C. M. (1990). *Determining social tasks: A preliminary report.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Roff, M. (1970). Childhood social interactions and young adult bad conduct. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63,* 333-337.

Roff, M., Sells, B., & Golden, M. (1972). *Social adjustment and personality development in children.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sabornie, E. J. (1985). Social mainstreaming of handicapped students: Facing an unpleasant reality. *Remedial and Special Education, 6(2),* 12-16.

Sarason, S., & Doris, J. (1978). Mainstreaming: Dilemmas, opposition, opportunities. In M. Reynolds (Ed.), *Futures of education for exceptional children: Emerging structures* (pp. 3-39). Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Schloss, P. J., Schloss, C. N., Wood, C. E., & Kiehl, W. S. (1986). A critical review of social skills research with behaviorally disordered students. *Behavioral Disorders, 12,* 1-14.

Sheperd, G. (1980). The treatment of social difficulties in special environments. In P. Feldman & J. Orford (Eds.), *Psychological problems: The social context* (pp. 312-359). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Stengel, E. (1971). *Suicide and attempted suicide.* Middlesex, NJ: Penguin.

Timo, K. S. (1988). *Adolescent social skills validation by teachers and students.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Washington, Seattle.

Ullman, C. A. (1957). Teacher, peers, and tests as predictors of adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 48,* 257-267.

Walker, H. M. (1984). The social behavior survival program (SBS): A systematic approach to the integration of handicapped children into less restrictive settings. *Education and Treatment of Children, 6,* 421-441.

Walker, H. M., & Rankin, R. (1983). Assessing the behavioral expectations and demands of less restrictive settings. *School Psychology Review, 12,* 274-284.

Walker, H. M., Todis, B., Holmes, D., & Horton, G. (1988). *The Walker social skills curriculum.* Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Williams, S. L., Walker, H. M., Holmes, D., Todis, B., & Fabre, T. R. (1989). Social validation of adolescent social skills by teacher and students. *Remedial and Special Education, 10(4),* 18-27.

Nancy B. Meadows, Project Coordinator, Department of Special Education, 103 Miller Hall, DQ-12, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Richard S. Neel, Professor of Special Education and Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, 206 Miller Hall, DQ-12, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195
Gerilyn Parker, Research Assistant, Department of Special Education, Miller Hall, DQ-12, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195
Kimberly Timo, Teacher of Mildly Handicapped Students, Highline School District, Seattle, Washington 98101

Received 12 October 1989
Initial acceptance 8 January 1990
(Final acceptance 20 April 1990)

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEWING STUDENTS TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMATIC SOCIAL TASKS

Interviewing Students to Investigate Problematic Social Tasks

Efforts to unravel the complex nature of social competence of school-aged children have been expanded at an increasing rate over the past twenty years (Dodge, 1986; Rubin and Krasnor, 1986; Neel & Cessna, 1991). The relationship between problematic social behavior of children and later negative outcomes regarding employment, independent living, and criminal offenses (Neel, Meadows, Levine, & Edgar, 1988; Robins, 1966; 1978) has lead researchers to explore interventions to teach socially competent behavior. If students can learn and use socially competent behavior it is assumed that they will become more effective in the social and academic challenges at school. This increased competence may then lead to completion of high school, training for employment and independent living as youn adults.

Two primary conceptual models have emerged over the past ten years to explain the concept of social competence. A social-information processing model has been described which emphasizes the cognitive role of the individual in perceiving environmental variables, thinking about and analyzing responses to meet situational demands, choosing behavioral responses, and enacting the behavior (Dodge, 1986; McFall, 1982). The second model, derived from a behavioral perspective, focuses directly on discrete sets of competent skills used by individuals in social interactions (Goldstein ,Sprafkin, Gershaw & Klein, 1980; Gresham, 1986; Walker & McConnell, 1988). Both approaches have had a strong influence on research to develop assessment and training programs for children exhibiting social difficulties. Reviews regarding the strengths and weaknesses of both cognitive (Ager & Cole, 1991; Gresham, 1986; Pellegrini & Urbain, 1985) and behavioral approaches (Gresham, 1981; Schloss, Schloss, Wood, & Kiehl, 1986; Zaragoza, Vaughn & McIntosh, 1991) are available elsewhere. While optomism is often noted concerning the ability of such programs to teach cognitive and behavioral skills to students, concern is mentioned regarding children's ability to generalize such skills to natural settings (Gresham, 1986; Schloss et. al., 1986) as well as the lasting impact of training on childrens' peer status (Zaragoza, Vaughn & McIntosh, 1991).

Several factors have been identified which effect the generalization of social skills to specific situations. These factors have included children's: a) accuracy at perceiving other's motives and behaviors, b) stimulus generalization, the use of new skills across new environments and c) ability to match effective social behavior with specific settings, (Coie & Koeppl, 1991; Stokes & Baer, 1977). A particular emphasis is currently being placed on the matching the matching of an individual's ability to perform socially competent behavior within contexts that present specific demands for using the skill (Dodge, McClaskey & Feldman, 1985; Dodge, 1986; Neel, Meadows, & Scott, 1990). This match between specific setting demands and effective student behavior to meet personal goals has been termed a social task (Dodge, 1986). While little empirical evidence exists about social tasks, they present some promise in addressing problems related to the issue of generalization.

A variety of social tasks have been identified for elementary students over the past decade (Putallaz, 1983; Dodge et. al., 1985, Neel et. al., 1990). These have been described in narrow (entering a game) and broad terms (making friends) (Dodge, 1986). It is apparent that elementary children who are judged as socially competent are adept at using effective social skills within appropriate social situations. Little is known, however, about the types of social tasks which middle school students encounter and how they are able to match skills to settings.

Recent inquiry into types of social tasks confronted by middle school students has identified a beginning taxonomy of critical tasks (Neel et. al., 1990). Two sets of respondents, school staff and students, generated lists of critical tasks students needed to respond to effectively to succeed at school. These tasks were later validated by a second larger sample of students and staff. While school staff were able to agree on fifteen critical tasks for school success, students were unable to agree on a set of critical tasks. A discrepancy apparently exists between how students and teachers think about the social tasks which are essential for school success (Meadows, Neel, Parker & Timo, 1991).

This finding is supportive of past research regarding teacher judgement in establishing social expectations. In numerous studies, teachers have reached agreement on social behavior which is required to be successful in classrooms (Walker and Rankin, 1983;) The conclusion of these studies has been that students must, at a minimal level, meet teacher social expectations to perform successfully within the classroom. To become more socially attractive to peers, students have another set of behaviors which are are required throughout the school day.

The purpose of this study of this study was to investigate the discrepancy between adult and student perception of social tasks in school. Several questions were asked:

1. Are adult generated social tasks also viewed as important by middle school students.
2. If a set of social tasks could be identified, which ones were judged as more important by students?
3. For those tasks that adults and students view as important, what are the characteristics of the people, setting and activities discussed?
4. Finally, are there differences in perception between regular education students and students with behavior disorders in tasks viewed as important or the characteristics of the tasks?

Method

Subjects

Students from three middle schools (Grades 6-9) participated in this study. The first step in student selection was to contact the parents of students who were identified as severely behaviorally disabled (SBD). Across the three schools, thirty students were identified with SBD and their parents were sent a letter which sought permission for their son/daughter to participate in the study.

From this group, twenty students received parental approval to be interviewed. All of the students were male, ranging in age from 11 to 15. The group included 6 sixth-graders, 3 seventh-graders, and 11 eighth-graders.. Ethnic backgrounds of the students are 11 African-Americans, 8 Caucasians, and 1 American Indian.

A second group of participants was then recruited from regular education classes. These students were matched to the special education by grade, race and sex. Teachers in matching grade levels identified males of the same race and obtained parental permission for the students to be interviewed. Since students were interviewed in pairs, the regular education group included 6 sixth graders, 4 seventh-graders, and 12 eighth graders for a total of 22 students.

Interviewers

Two project staff members, one male and one female, served as interviewers for this study. The interviewers were trained in interview format and pilot tested the procedure with two pairs of regular education students from a nearby middle school. Practice sessions were videotaped and reviewed by the project director to discuss standardization of the interview format.

One of the interviewers conducted interviews with 14 of the students with SBD and eight of the regular education students. The second interviewer completed interviews with six of the special education students and 12 regular education students. Each interviewer worked with students across two schools.

Interview Format

Interviewers met with students in pairs, except in two cases of special education classrooms where two students were interviewed individually. Two forty-five minute sessions were completed across two consecutive days with the students. These two periods allowed for enough time to meet the students, establish rapport, describe the project and complete the interview questions.

The interview was composed of questions regarding 15 social tasks derived from Neel et. al., (1991). These social tasks were initially generated and validated by over 100 teachers, administrators, support personnel and students in schools in Washington and Colorado. The 15 tasks used in this study were validated by over 60% of the school personnel, represented a balance of items relating to peer and teacher interactions, and were similar to social tasks or social problems reviewed in other studies (Dodge, et. al., 1986; Walker and McConnell, 1988).

The social tasks were written to describe social issues which students have to deal with at school. The students were read the social task and then asked if this was something that had happened to them at school. If they answered yes, they wee asked to describe a time when they had to deal with the task and give contextual details (e.g. "Where were you, who was there, and what happened"?). After the first description, students were asked to describe additional situations in which they dealt with the social task. If students stated that the task had not happened to them at school, they were asked if the task had happened to other students. The following is an example of one of the interview items.

> **Interviewer: Sometimes students in middle school have to deal with being provoke (stirred up, challenged) by another kid to fight or argue.**
>
> **Has this ever happened to you at your school? Yes___ No___**
> **If no, has this happened to other students at your school?**
>
> **I'd like you to pick a time and tell me more about the situation. Where were you and what happened? What did you say or do? How did that work? What did others say or do? What Happened next?**
>
> **What else could you do in this situation? How would that have worked? What would others say or do? Can you think of other things to do in this situation?**
>
> **Can you think of another situation when you had to deal with being provoked?**

Efforts were made by the interviewers to encourage both students to respond to each item. After one student responded, the other student was given an opportunity to expand on situation or describe any similar situations he had encountered.

Interviews were videotaped, transcribed for verbal content, and coded. Coding categories were developed by project staff to classify the nature of the situations generated by the students. Students' responses to social task questions were coded for three characteristics : a) participants involved, b) physical location, and c) type of activity.

The participant category included interactions which occurred between the target student and : a) another peer, b) multiple peers, c) teacher(s), d) administrators or counselors, e) an instructional assistant, f) generally stated 'other kids', g) other people or not stated. Location of situations was coded as occurring in: a) classrooms, b) hallways c) lunchrooms, d) school office, e) library, f) gym, g) school grounds, h) field trip sites, i) buses, j) other or k) nonstated locations. Activities were coded as: a) instructional-supervised in classroom, b) noninstructional or c) nonstated.

Data Analysis

Two steps of analyses were completed to evaluate the social validity and content of the social tasks used in the interviews. First, project staff were interested in those tasks which students acknowledged as occurring in school. Therefore, a 60% agreement level among students interviewed was established to verify that the social task was an observed problem in their school. The 60% criteria was consistent with the percentage level established in Neel, Meadows and Scott (1990) to determine the validity of social problems across respondents surveyed.

For those items which met the 60% validation criteria in this study, a further analysis was conducted regarding the content of each students response. Frequency counts of the types of participants, settings, and activities were completed to analyze the features of the social situations described by students. For items that one group generated more situations than the other group, independent T-tests were completed to note any statistical differences between the regular and special education population. For these tests, students were given a 0 if they had not observed the social task at school and a 1 for each situation they described. Thus, a student who described 3 situations of being provoked by peers would receive a score of 3. Means for each group were calculated and T-tests completed to evaluate group differences.

Results

The first step in the analysis was to identify those items validated by 60% or more of the students. Table 1 displays the social tasks used in the interview and the percentage of regular and special education students who reported the task had occurred at their school.

As shown in Table 1, eleven (11) of the social tasks were validated by 60% of the students in both groups. Four of these items were related to student-teacher interactions, five specific to peer interactions, and two of the items were not specific as to other actors. The content of the situations generated by students for these 11 items was further analyzed to determine any differences between the regular and special education students.

Table 2 reports the frequency of participant types (teachers, peers, groups, others) reported by students for the social tasks. Peer related tasks produced 194 situations involving other peers. Teacher related tasks elicited 130 situations involving teachers and an additional 24 that included other adults (administrators, counselors).

Table 3 lists the frequency of location types of situations reported for social tasks validated by both groups. Across all possible school locations, the main location of social situations described was in the classroom (Total = 193 situations). The frequent identification of the classroom setting was consistent across peer-related, teacher-related and nonspecified tasks. Many locations were not explicitly stated by students as indicated in the "Not Stated" column of Table 3. The next most frequent location reported was "Other" which referred to the lunchroom, office, library, gym, field trips, or the bus. These locations were combined because no single location comprised more than 5% of the total situations. Hallways were reported as the locations for 46 situations and 26 situations occurred on the school grounds.

Finally, Table 4 shows the type of activity described by students for the social tasks. For situations describing these tasks, most did not state whether the activity was instructional or not. These unstated activities constituted 233 of the described social situations. Situations during noninstructional times accounted for 151 of the situations and those during instruction included 101 situations.

As expected, both groups in peer related and teacher related items gave responses which described social problems with these people. The only differences are seen in descriptions of dealing with individual peers or multiple peers. Additionally, specificity is noted in the difference between teacher interactions and other adults, such as administrators, counselors and instructional assistants.

Discussion

The first question under investigation in this study was whether middle school students would validate the social tasks generated primarily by adult school staff in Neel and his coleagues (Neel, et. al., 1990). As Table 1 displayed, 11 of the 15 items were agreed upon by 60% or more of students in both groups. This agreement lends credence to the assumption that teachers and students alike are perceiving similar social tasks confronting students in urban middle schools.

This agreement has particular relevance for school staff as a basis for organizing assessment and training materials which deal with social issues. The commonality between adults and students indicates that these social tasks may have salient features which teachers and staff frequently observe. These features, which may be thought of as contextual variables, should be considered in discussions or analyses of social problems with students. By including agreed upon content during instruction, there is a higher likelihood that new skills or strategies can be incorporated into student use to resolve conflicts.

Students validated tasks which were both peer-related, teacher-related, and nonspecific. This validation across characteristics of persons indicated that the students are sensitive to social issues affecting them from all actors in school. This balance of perceiving social tasks related to teachers and peers alike suggests that middle school students are indeed cognizant of the varying sorts of social demands presented by peers and teachers. This is somewhat contrary to beliefs that middle school students are preoccupied by their interactions and status with their peer group alone.

Some differences were evident between regular and general education students on the eleven items validated. General education students more frequently agreed that they were blamed for things they didn't do, were hit by others and were criticized by peers. Special education students had higher agreement as a group on being provoked by peers and criticized by teachers.

The differences between student groups was of interest as an aspect of the second question of inquiry in this study. The second question of the student was identify the characteristics of people, location and activity in the situations reported by students. The identification of the characteristics of situations was seen as relevant to assessment and training methods, while student differences were an objective to note variation in the groups social perceptions at school.

Overall, general education students reported slightly more involvement of peers in their situations discussed. This was most pronounced for the two items concerning peer criticism and peer pressure. Some of this criticism was identified in the interviews by students as gaming and teasing. It was evident that many of the general education students expected teasing and criticism from peers, but did not perceive these interactions to be negative or problematic. Apparently, students must learn to discern the subtle differences between negative peer criticism and evaluation and the more frequent teasing and gaming which occurs.

Contrasting to peer-related items, teacher-related items were very similarly reported across the four validated items. There were no significant differences in the number of teachers reported within these items (see Table 2). Special education students did, however, report more difficulties in dealing with other adults in school. This was a function of two factors. First, special education students reported social situations involving the instructional assistants in their classrooms. Secondly, they reported more situations with administrators and counselors concerning conflicts they were resolving.

One other interesting finding is that general education students produced five more items than special education students on the item about being blamed for something they didn't do. As reported by these students, these accusations are without merit but are difficult to disprove. This increase of reporting may be related to the greater number of teachers and students they deal with throughout the school day. Many of the special education students spent the majority of their classroom day in special education classes.

When the characteristic of location was analyzed for the situations reported, the three most frequently identified locations were in the classroom, hallway and school grounds. Within the classroom, special education students reported a slightly higher frequency of being responsible for their own actions. This finding may suggest that personal responsibility is emphasized on a more individual basis for special education students. With this increased emphasis they may have been more prone to identify instances when they felt responsible for causing problems in class.

Similar patterns of peer-related problems for both groups were reported during hallway times. General education students identified 12 more situations relating to peers around the school grounds. This may be due to their increased mobility during and after the school day. They are more apt to take breaks, be in P.E. on the playground or participate in during or after school sports on the grounds. Due to this increased opportunity, they report more situations related to peer problems on the school grounds.

Students in both groups were in strong agreement that if they were to have problems with tasks related to teachers, these situations would occur in the classroom. Students in both groups reported similar frequencies of situations for dealing with the four teacher-related tasks. This indicates that many of the student interactions are becoming more "business" related in middle school, revolving around classroom objectives and interactions. Relatively few interactions were identified outside the classroom. Hallways, lunchrooms and school grounds become the province for peer interactions and less interaction with teachers.

In an interesting finding, general education reported more situations of being hit by others in class. This was generally reported as instances of poking or hitting for fun and not in a malicious manner. General education students may be more adept at using physical forms of hitting as ways of jesting in a nonharmful was with one another, while special education students reserve this behavior for outside the classroom.

In the final characteristic of the situations which was evaluated, type of activity, strong and unique differences were found between student groups on their reporting. When peer related items were discussed with students, special education students were much more likely to report situations in non-instructional activities. These activities could be in or out of the classroom, but were not occurring during instructional times. This was evident for items concerning peer provocation, dealing with tough kids, being rejected by peers, and dealing with peer pressure. This finding suggests that less structured and transition time periods are likely times when students with behavior disorders will encounter more social difficulties.

General education students, on the other hand, reported more items relating to teachers during instructional times than did special education students. This probably indicates increased opportunities for teacher related problems when one or more of their teachers is perceived as difficult. Again, the general education students had to deal with a greater number of teachers throughout their day and this could impact this finding. Special education students reported more problems than general education students during noninstructional times. This is consistent with the difficulties discussed above during transition time periods.

In summary, this study did provide findings that students, both general and special education, validated items previously agreed upon by adult school staff as problematic social tasks. The eleven tasks validated by students and adults alike were further analyzed for relevant characteristics and group differences. General education students were found to generate more peer-related situations, while special education students reported more difficulties with dealing with adults at school. General education students reported more situations on the school grounds with peers, and both groups reported the classroom as the most frequent settings for teacher-related problems. Finally, special education reported more situations during noninstructional times than did general education students. Finally, general education students identified more problems with teachers during instructional activities.

These findings should be treated with some degree of tentativeness due to the small number of students involved in the interviews. It should be recalled, however, that the extended population which generated the problems included over 50 adults. As such, then, the students were lending an increased level of confirmation to the existing data on social tasks. It appears that the top eleven items pertaining to peers, teachers and nonspecific people are important tasks relating to the social functioning of middle school students. This content would appear to be germane to any attempts of assessment or training regarding social functioning of middle school students.

References

Ager, C. L. & Cole, C. L. (1991). A review of cognitive-behavioral interventions for children and adolescents with behavioral disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 16(4), 276-287.

Coie, J. D. & Kepttl, G. K. (1990). Adapting intervention to the problems of aggressive and disruptive rejected children. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.) Peer rejection in Childhood. (pp. 309-337) New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dodge, K. (1986). A social information processing model of social competence in children. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), Minnesota symposium in child psychology, (Vol. 8, pp. 77-125). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dodge, K. & Coie, J. (1987). Social-information processing factors in reactive and proactive aggression in children's peer groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 1146-1158.

Dodge, K., McClaskey, C.L., & Feldman, E. (1985). Situational approach to the assessment of social competence in children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53(3), 344-353.

Goldstein, A. P., Sprafkin, R. P., Gershaw, N. J. & Klien, P. (1980). Skillstreaming the adolescent. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Gresham, F. M. (1981). Social skills training with handicapped children: A review. Review of Educational Research, 51(1), 139-176.

Gresham, F. (1986). Conceptual issues in th assessment of social competence in children. In P. Strain, M. Guralnick, & H. Walker (Eds.), Children's social behavior: Development, assessment and modification, New York:: Academic Press.

Meadows, N. B., Neel, R. S. , Parker, G. M. & Timo, K. (1991). A validation of social skills with behavior disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 16(3), 200-210.

Neel, R. & Cessna, K. (in press). Behavioral intent: Instructional content for children with behavior disorders. In K. Cessna & R. S. Neel (Eds.), Monograph: Instructionally differentiated programming: A needs-based approach for students with behavior disorders. Colorado Department of education , Denver, CO.

Neel, R. S., Meadows, N. B., Levine, P. & Edgar, E. G. (1988). What happens after special education: A statewide follow-up study of secondary students who have behavioral disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 13(3), 209-216.

Neel, R., Meadows, N. & Scott, C. (1990) Determining social tasks: A preliminary report. Monograph in Behavioral Disorders: Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth, Vol 13. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Pelligrini, D. S., & Urbain, E. S. (1985). An evaluation of interpersonal cognitive problem solving training with children. Journal of Child Psychiatry, 26(1), 17-41.

Putallaz, M. (1983). Predicting children's sociometric status from their behavior. Child Development, 54, 1417-1426.

Robins, L. (1966). Deviant children grown up. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.

Robins, L. (1978). Sturdy predictors of adult outcomes: Replications from longitudinal studies. Psychological Medicine, 1978, 8, 611-622.

Rubin, K. H. & Krasnor, L. (1986). Social-cognitive and social behavioral perspectives on problem-solving. In M. Perimutter (Ed.), Minnesota symposium in child psychology, (Vol. 8, pp. 1-68). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schloss, P. J. Schloss, C. N., Wood, C. E., & Kiehl, W. S. (1984). A critical review of social skills research with behaviorally disordered students. Behavioral Disorders, 12, 1-14.

Stokes, T. & Baer, D. (1977). An implicit technology of generalization. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 10, 349-367.

Walker, H.M. & McConnell, S. R. (1988) The Walker-McConnell Scale of Social Competence and School Adjustment. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Walker, H. M. & Rankin, R. (1983). Assessing the behavioral expectations and demands of less restrictive settings. School Psychology Review, 12, 274-284.

Zaragoza, N., Vaughn, S., & McIntosh, R. (1991). Social skills interventions and children with behavior problems: A review. Behavioral Disorders, 16(4), 260-275.

Percentage of Agreement Among Student Groups
For the Social Tasks - Ordered by Totals for Both Groups

Social Task	Percent Agreement Special Education N = 20	 Regular Education N = 22	 Total N = 42
Provoked by a peer to fight or argue	100% (20)	82% (18)	90% (38)
Dealing with consequences of own behavior - Lose temper with a teacher	80% (16)	86% (19)	83% (35)
Criticized or corrected by a teacher in class	90% (18)	73% (16)	81% (34)
Blamed for something you didn't do	70% (14)	91% (20)	81% (34)
Hit others at school	70% (14)	86% (19)	79% (33)
Provoked or hasseled by a teacher	85% (17)	68% (17)	76% (32)
Criticized by another student	60% (12)	86% (19)	74% (31)
Rejected by other students	65% (13)	73% (16)	69% (29)
Responsible for own actions - Picking on peer causes a problem	65% (13)	68% (15)	67% (28)
Dealing with tough kids	65% (13)	68% (15)	67% (28)
Dealing with teachers who don't like you	65% (13)	64% (14)	65% (27)
Dealing with peer pressure	55% (11)	73% (16)	64% (27)
Betrayed by other students	50% (10)	50% (11)	50% (21)
Having a possession broken or destroyed	35% (7)	50% (11)	43% (18)
Betrayed by a teacher	20% (4)	18% (4)	24% (8)

Neel & Meadows (1991).

Neel & Meadows (1991).

Table 2
Frequency of Participant Types for Reported Situations

Task No.	SITUATION PARTICIPANTS									
Peer-Related Items	Single Peer		Multiple Peers		Teacher(s)		Other Adult		General Case	
	#SE	GE	SE	GE	SE	GE	SE	GE	SE	GE
1	22	18	5	3	0	0	0	0	2	3
4	11	11	2	6	4	0	1	0	2	0
5	7	8	9	3	0	0	0	0	2	6
8	8	17	2	4	0	0	0	0	5	3
10	3	2	10	13	0	0	1	1	3	4
##14	6	13	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	3
Totals	57	69	35	34	4	0	2	1	14	19
Teacher-Related Items										
2	1	0	0	0	22	19	4	0	0	0
6	0	1	1	1	14	16	5	1	1	2
7	0	0	0	0	17	20	8	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	10	12	4	2	0	0
Totals	1	1	1	1	63	67	21	3	1	2
Unspecified Items										
3	10	14	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	8
9	9	6	2	2	5	10	1	2	2	0
Totals	19	20	2	5	5	10	1	2	6	8

# SE = Special Education Students
GE = General Education Students
## Validated by General Education Students only

Table 3
Frequency of Reported Locations for Validated Items

Task No.	PHYSICAL LOCATION									
Peer-Related Items	Class-room		Hall		School Grounds		≠Other		Not Stated	
	#SE	GE	SE	GE	SE	GE	SE	GE	SE	GE
1	7	6	5	3	3	3	9	5	5	7
4	9	5	1	2	0	5	1	1	9	4
5	1	0	3	3	1	5	7	2	6	7
8	6	7	2	0	0	2	4	3	5	10
10	1	0	1	1	1	2	8	10	6	7
##14	5	4	1	1	0	0	2	4	4	12
Totals	29	22	13	10	5	17	31	25	35	47
Teacher-Related Items										
2	16	12	2	4	0	0	4	3	5	0
6	14	15	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	5
7	20	19	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	1
11	8	9	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	1
Totals	58	55	5	6	1	0	10	7	13	7
Unspecified Items										
3	0	5	5	5	1	0	0	5	8	10
9	13	11	0	2	0	2	3	4	2	2
Totals	13	16	5	7	1	2	3	9	10	12

#	SE = Special Education Students
	GE = General Education Students
##	Validated by General Education Students only
≠	Other = Lunchroom, office, library, gym, field trips, bus

Table 4
Frequency of Activity Type for Validated Items

Task No.	TYPE OF ACTIVITY					
Peer-Related Items	Instructional		Non-Instructional		Not Stated	
	#SE	GE	SE	GE	SE	GE
1	1	3	21	11	7	10
4	0	2	3	6	17	9
5	0	0	15	7	3	10
8	3	5	5	8	7	11
10	0	2	12	7	5	11
##14	2	1	8	3	3	17
Totals	6	13	64	42	42	68
Teacher-Related Items						
2	4	10	6	1	17	8
6	2	12	2	2	17	7
7	9	16	5	0	11	4
11	1	5	2	1	11	8
Totals	16	43	15	4	56	27
Unspecified Items						
3	0	3	7	9	7	13
9	1	9	6	4	12	8
Totals	1	12	13	13	19	21

# SE = Special Education Students
GE = General Education Students
## Validated by General Education Students only

APPENDIX H

PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT OF AN OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT OF AN OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

The importance of directly assessing social competence within the context of naturally occurring social interactions has been well documented in the literature (see Gresham, 1986 for a review). Direct observation methods allow for the assessment of antecedents and consequences in the "stream of behavior" as well as the opportunity to evaluate actual social effectiveness (Krasnor & Rubin, 1983). The purpose of this study was to pilot procedures for developing an observational protocol which incorporates findings from previous phases of the project. In particular, the usefulness of empirically enumerated and validated social tasks, situations, and behaviors in the assessment process was explored. The following research question was addressed in this pilot: how can information gained from student interviews and teacher ratings be used to develop a situation-specific and contextually relevant behavior observation protocol to inform intervention programming for students with serious behavior disorders?

Participants & Settings

One of the three middle schools which had participated in the Interview Study was selected as the observation site (For a complete description of the school, see Appendix H). This phase of the project involved four male students from the original group of special education subjects. They were identified by the school district as having serious behavior disorders and were being served in a self-contained classroom. Two of the students selected for observation were mainstreamed into a regular eighth-grade math class. The other two students remained in the self-contained classroom for all academic instruction. All four subjects were observed in the self-contained special education classroom three times a week. In addition, the two mainstreamed students were observed in their regular math classroom three times a week.

Behavioral Definitions

The research staff utilized two main sources of information to develop the preliminary observation protocol: (a) the student interviews conducted in Study 7 (See Appendix H), and (b) teacher ratings of individual students' ability to handle problematic social tasks.

Student Interviews. (For a complete report, please see Appendix H: Study 7.) The general findings of the Interview Study indicate that middle school students regard peer provocation and teacher feedback situations as problematic. Of the peer-related items discussed in the interviews, being provoked to fight or argue was the one situation validated as problematic by all of the special education subjects. Of the teacher -related items discussed in the interviews, dealing with correction or criticism from a teacher was the situation validated by the greatest number of special education participants, followed by the item pertaining to being "hassled" by a teacher.

Teacher Ratings. Teachers of the special education students had previously completed the Social Skills Taxonomy, a checklist developed during the earlier phases of the project and reported in Neel, Meadows, & Scott, 1991 (See Appendix A). For the present study, responses of the math teacher and the special education teacher on items pertaining to peer provocation and teacher feedback were reviewed. Their ratings were consistent with the students' interview responses. This information contributed to the hypothesis that situations and behaviors involving peer provocation and teacher feedback are key social tasks and may be potentially critical intervention targets for impacting mainstreaming success. (This hypothesis remains to be tested.) The selection of the two target social tasks, dealing with peer provocation and dealing with teacher feedback, was based on student interview responses and teacher ratings. Because effective peer-peer and student-teacher interactions are both important to school success, one of each type of task was selected for observation.

The next step involved identification of common behavioral reactions to the selected social tasks. This was accomplished by listing the behaviors described by the students for each of the interview items pertaining to peer provocation and teacher feedback. To get as wide a sample of student- generated behaviors as possible, all interview transcripts were reviewed and summarized. Figure 1 provides the reference list of student behaviors used in the observational coding.

Observational Procedures

Naturalistic observations of classroom interactions were conducted during 50-minute periods in each setting three times per week for six weeks during spring quarter. Recordings were made by three research assistants who were introduced as university students involved in an assignment to observe the class.

Observer A observed the two mainstreamed math students (MM1 and MM2) throughout the study, Observer B observed MM1 and one nonmainstreamed student (NM1) in the self-contained special education classroom, and Observer C observed MM2 and the second nonmainstreamed student.

Figure 2 provides an example of the direct observation form. The initial plan called for four 12-minute observation intervals, alternating between the two subjects. However, after three sessions in the Math setting, it was determined that, due to a favorable room arrangement and low frequency of the target behaviors, it was possible to conduct a running record of interactions for both students simultaneously throughout the 48-minutes. This adjustment was made in the protocol for the Math setting only.

Observers recorded each interaction that met the criteria for inclusion as peer provocation or teacher feedback, coding for situation and behavior. Each incident was then recorded as conflict (C) or nonconflict (N) and evaluated for outcome in terms of whether the situation was resolved (R) or not resolved (N).

Discussion

Due to the limited scope and preliminary nature of the work at this stage, discussion of the process and data is limited to very general comments. With respect to the process of developing procedures, project staff members agreed that generating a reference list of situations and behaviors from interviews and teacher ratings satisfied the goal of being sensitive to local norms. Observers reported no difficulty in assigning the prescribed coding categories to the observed interactions. The lists were broad enough to capture nearly all the behaviors and the various descriptors appeared to be adequate. Observers found that the groups were not overly concerned with the presence of the "university students."

Regarding the data collected in the special education classroom, rates of interaction were variable from day to day with no discernible cyclical patterns. There were no clear differences between the mainstreamed and nonmainstreamed students. In the math setting, the incidence of provocation and difficulty with feedback were nearly nonexistent even though the math teacher had reported on the checklist that both students had had significant problems in these areas. This illustrates the importance of gathering information from multiple sources when planning an intervention.

References

Gresham, F. M. (1986). Conceptual issues in the assessment of social competence in children. In P. S. Strain, M. J. Guralnick, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), Children's Social behaivor: Development, Assessment, and Modification, (pp. 143-179). FL: Academic Press.

Krasnor, L. & Rubin, K. (1983). Preschool social problem solving: Attempts and outcomes in nautralistic interaction. Child Development, 54, 1545-1558.

Neel, R. S., Meadows, N. B., & Scott, C. M. (1990). Determining social tasks: A preliminary report. Monograph in Behavioral Disorders: Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth (Vol. 13). reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

APPENDIX I

ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL BEHAVIORS OF MAINSTREAMED AND NON-MAINSTREAMED STUDENTS WITH SERIOUS BEHAVIOR DISORDERS

Academic and Social Behaviors of Mainstreamed and Non-Mainstreamed Students with Serious Behavior Disorders

Children with behavior disorders are educated in both general and special education settings. They are, however, less successful in general education settings. As a matter of fact, students with behavior disorders are among the least successful of all handicapped students served in general education settings (Gable, Hendrickson & Rutherford, 1991). Socially, they are twice as likely to be rejected by their peers than students with learning disabilities; they are three time more likely to rejected than their non-handicapped cohorts (Kupersmidt, Patterson, & Griesler, 1988). Academically, students with behavior disorders receive average to below-average grades and are most often mainstreamed into basic or remedial classes (Truesdale, 1988; 1990; Meadows, Scott, Parker & Neel, 1991).

Despite this pattern, we continue to mainstream students with behavior disorders into general education classrooms. Our attempts to facilitate the transition between general and special education settings includes teaching students various social skills as well as attempts to remediate students academically. If the data reported in the literature are accurate, our current approaches to mainstreaming will have to be reevaluated and refined and new approaches explored. Along with improving our methods of instruction, we will need to assess the impact of improved academic and social competency on the successful mainstreaming of students with serious behavior disorders into general education settings.

Research has focused primarily on comparing the academic and social performance of students with mild handicaps to their non-handicapped peers. The purpose of the present study was to compare the academic and social characteristics of SBD students who remain in self-contained classrooms to SBD students who are mainstreamed into general education settings. We chose to look at the performance of students with behavioral disorders separate from other categories of exceptionality. The following research questions were posed:

Research question one: Are there differences between mainstreamed students and students not mainstreamed on measures of academic competence?

Research question two: Are there differences on the social/behavioral competence measures between students who were mainstreamed versus those who were not?

Research question three: Are there differences between mainstreamed and not mainstreamed students on school related descriptive variables?

Research question four: Are there differences between how special education teachers and general education teachers rated the mainstreamed students on the measures of social competence?

METHOD

School Settings

Data were collected from three middle schools in a large urban school district in the Pacific Northwest. The schools were selected because they had self-contained classrooms for students with behavior problems and because they participated in academic mainstreaming.

Subjects

Nineteen 6th, 7th, and 8th grade male students with mild disabilities participated in this study. All students were placed in self-contained classrooms due to identified behavior problems . Labels for the students included: Seriously Behaviorally Disabled (SBD), Specific Learning Disabled (SLD), Mild Mental Retardation (MMR), and Health Impaired (HI). Initially, twenty students returned parent/guardian consent forms. One student left the school district before all data were collected and was dropped from the data analysis. Of the nineteen students, thirteen were mainstreamed (M) into various classes for at least one hour a day. The other six students were served exclusively in the special education classroom, i.e. not mainstreamed (NM). The mean age of all subjects was 13 years 4 months. The mainstreamed students mean age was 13 years 6 months. The mean age of students not mainstreamed was 13 years. Table 1 reports student characteristics for M and NM groups.

Insert Table 1 about here

Data Sources

1. *Achenbach Behavior Checklists* (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1986). Three versions of the Achenbach Behavior Checklists were used: the Child Behavior Checklist-Parent version, the Teacher's Report Form; and the Youth Self-Report Form. All three versions consist of 112-113 problem behaviors to be rated by parents/guardians, teachers, or students, respectively. The behaviors selected were based on research literature and consultation with child psychologists, psychiatrists and psychiatric social workers.

The listed behaviors present a broad range of problems relevant to childrens' mental health and reportable by either an adult or the child. Almost all of the behaviors are observable statements of problems, with a few exceptions, such as "feels inferior" and "thinks about sex too much". Each of the behaviors is scored on a three step response scale: (0) = not true, (1) = somewhat or sometimes true, and (2) = very true or often true.

All three versions of the Achenbach Behavior Checklist have two broad band groupings of behavior problems which reflect a distinction between fearful, inhibited, overcontrolled behavior and aggressive, antisocial, undercontrolled behavior. The manuals refer to these broad distinctions as the Internalizing-Externalizing Dichotomy. Each version of the Achenbach Checklist provides the rater with three main scores: Internalizing, Externalizing, and a Sum score. Within these two broad band categories are included a number of narrower, more specific subscales, which differ on each of the three versions used in this study. A brief description of versions and their subscales follows.

a. The Child Behavior Checklist-Parent (CBCL) version. Within the Externalizing band are included the subscales Aggressive, Delinquent, and Hyperactive. Within the

Internalizing band are included the subscales Somatic Complaints, Schizoid, Uncommunicative, Immature, and Obsessive Compulsive. One subscale, Hostile Withdrawal, contributes items to both broad bands.

In addition, the CBCL provides three social competence scales to be rated by the parent/guardian: (a) Activities - number of sports, skill and participation levels, nonsport activities, number of jobs, and quality of jobs; (b) Social - amount and degree of participation in organizations, number of friends, frequency of contacts, and behavior alone and with others; and (c) School - mean level of performance, special class placement, retentions, and problems.

b. Teacher's Report Form (TRF). Within the Externalizing band are included the subscales Inattentive and Aggressive. The Internalizing band includes the subscales Social Withdrawal and Anxious. Four subscales (Unpopular, Obsessive-Compulsive, Immature, and Self-Destructive) have items that contribute to both broad bands.

In addition, the TRF provides five adaptive functioning subscales to be rated by the teacher: (a) School Performance, (b) Working Hard, (c) Behaving Appropriately, (d) Learning, and (e) Happy.

c. The Youth Self-Report (YSR). The version of the YSR used in this study provides the rater with a profile for boys aged eleven to eighteen. The YSR is rated by the student him/herself. Within the Externalizing band of the YSR are included the subscales Delinquent and Aggressive. The Internalizing band includes the subscales Depressed and Unpopular. Three subscales (Somatic Complaints, Self-Destructive/Identity Problems, and Thought Disorder) contribute items to both bands.

In addition, the YSR provides the student with two Competence subscales, activities and social. The Activities and Social Competence scales are similar to those described for the CBCL, except that the questions are asked in the first person. The child is asked to describe how involved s/he is in sports, organizations, and friendships.

2. *Walker-McConnell Adolescent Scale of Social Competence and School Adjustment* (W-M) (Walker & McConnell, in press). The W-M contains forty-eight positively worded items to be rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "never" to "frequently". The skills listed in the survey were designed to provide information regarding 4 behavioral domains considered to be important to adolescent development: (a) Self-Control (12 items), (b) Peer Relations (20 items), (c) School Adjustment (10 items), and (d) Empathy (6 items), and a total score.

3. *Social Task List* (STL) (Neel, Meadows, & Scott, 1990). The STL is composed of thirty-one social tasks that may present problems for adolescents. The STL was developed using a modified Delphi technique which required participants to list those social tasks which they felt were most difficult for adolescents to handle. The resulting list then underwent two additional rounds of evaluation in order to achieve consensus (60% agreement) regarding the importance of the tasks. Social tasks were generated by special education teachers, general education teachers, university professors with expertise in behavior disorders, related service personnel (e.g. counselors, speech therapists), and socially competent general education students. The STL uses a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from "no problem" to "significant problem", for use in rating each problematic situation. For a more complete description of the preliminary STL, see Neel, Meadows, & Scott (1990).

4. *School Records.* An adapted version of the Walker School Archival Record Search (SARS) (Walker, Block, Todis, Severson, Barckley, & Rankin, 1989) was used to gather information from school behavioral and cumulative records. The SARS was developed as a screening device to identify students in general and/or special education who might be at risk for needing special services for behavior problems. The adapted SARS (A-SARS) was used to look at characteristics of students already identified as having behavior problems. This difference in purpose led the research staff to make several changes to the original form of the SARS.

First, any variable that obviously referred to general education students was dropped or altered. For example, the variable on pupil status was omitted. The variable on placement outside of the regular education classroom was altered to refer to mainstream status. It was also necessary to use different test data, since National Norm Percentiles (NNP) were not available for special education students. In addition to these changes, two variables were added: the age at which the student became a focus of concern (FOC), and a list of the students' mainstream classes. A-SARS encompassed nine school related areas: demographics (age, sex, school, grade, ethnicity, number of schools attended, and age student became focus of concern), attendance, test information, Individualized Education Plans (IEP), mainstream status, related services, discipline contacts, and grades. The purpose of the A-SARS was to identify variables that potentially discriminated between students who were mainstreamed and those who were not.

Data Collection

Various sources of data were used to investigate the differences between those students who were mainstreamed and those who were served exclusively in the special education classroom. Data were gathered during the 1990-1991 academic year. Sources of information for each student included: (a) special education teachers, (b) general education teachers, (c) parents/guardians, (d) self-report, and (e) school records.

1. *Special/General Education Teachers*. Teachers were asked to complete the Achenbach Teacher Report Form, the Walker-McConnell Adolescent Scale of Social Competence and School Adjustment, and the Social Task List on all students. The teachers were instructed to follow the directions provided with each of the three instruments.

The three special education teachers were then asked to recommend a general education teacher who taught those students who were mainstreamed. Twelve (92%) of the general education teachers who were nominated agreed to participate. The general education teachers then assessed the mainstreamed students once again on the TRF, W-M, and the STL. They received the same instructions to follow the directions provided with each instrument.

2. *Parent/Guardians.* Special education teachers sent the parent version of the Achenbach (CBCL) home with the students to be completed by the student's parent/guardian. The CBCL was accompanied by a letter instructing parents to either contact the special education teacher or a member of the research staff with any questions or requests for help. Fourteen parents/guardians (74%) returned the CBCL.

3. *Students.* Students completed the Youth Self Report (YSR) with teacher and research assistants providing assistance if necessary. Eighteen students (95%) completed the YSR; one student refused to participate.

4. *School Records Search.* Two research assistants used the A-SARS to conduct a school records search. They visited the participating schools and the district special education office in order to obtain the information. The A-SARS data were gathered in the last half of the 1990-1991 school year, February through May. Individualized Education Plans (IEP) were located in the special education classroom and in the main special education office, which also housed the cumulative special education records. Additional cumulative records containing grades and discipline contacts were located in counselors' offices and in the main offices. Behavioral files were located in counselors' offices, district special education office, and special education teachers classroom. In addition to these record searches, the special education teachers were interviewed to identify related services that their students were receiving in or out of school.

Data Analysis Procedures

Descriptive variables are reported in Tables 1 and 5 by means and ranges. Independent variables are listed in Tables 2, 3 and 4 with their means and standard deviations reported. Independent variables were analyzed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to identify differences between students who are mainstreamed and those who are not mainstreamed. To detect differences between special and general education teachers ANOVA was used. Table 5 lists significant and not significant results.

RESULTS

Research question one: Are there differences between mainstreamed students and students not mainstreamed on measures of academic competence?

Table 2 reports the means and standard deviations of scores from the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT), the Woodcock-Johnson Achievement Test (Woodcock), and grade point average (GPA). Significant differences were found between N and NM groups in spelling (WRAT) and GPA. The mean score of the mainstreamed students was 16.23 in spelling as compared to the NM students mean score was 10.33, $F\ (1,17) = 4.50$, $p < .05$. The mean GPA for mainstreamed students was 2.52 and the mean GPA for not mainstreamed students was 1.62 ($F\ (1, 16) = 11.02$, $p < .005$). The scores of the two groups of students did not differ significantly in reading, math or written language (see Table 2).

Insert Table 2 about here

Research question two: Are there differences on the social/behavioral competence measures between students who were mainstreamed versus those who were not?

There were significant differences on how the special education teachers rated the two groups of students (N, NM) on the Internalizing, Externalizing, and Sum scores of the TRF. In all instances, the scores of the NM students were significantly higher. The Internalizing mean score of the M students was 54.83, while the NM students mean score was 64.83, $F\ (1, 17) = 14.31$, $p < .05$. This trend was also present for the Externalizing score, $F\ (1, 17) = 13.55$, $p < .005$. The mean Externalizing score of the M students was 60.15, while the NM students mean score was 71.17. The mean Sum score on the TRF for the M students was 60.00 and the NM students mean Sum score was 71.00, $F\ (1, 17)$

= 14.31, p < .005. There were significant differences between the mainstreamed and not mainstreamed students on the adaptive functioning subscales of the TRF. Overall, the M students mean score on the adaptive functioning was 40.23 and the NM students mean score was 27.33, F (1, 17) = 20.31, p < .001. See Table 3 for the results of the individual subscales.

Insert Table 3 about here

The total score on the STL was significantly higher for students not mainstreamed, F (1, 17) = 5.35, p < .05. The mean score for the mainstreamed group was 3.11 and the mean score for the NM group was 4.01.

There were no significant differences between mainstreamed and not mainstreamed students on the total scores of the W-M, the YSR, or the CBCL. There were no significant differences in the subscale scores on the CBCL. There was one significant difference on the Aggression subscale of the YSR, with the mainstreamed students rating themselves as being more aggressive. The mean Aggressive subscale score of the M students was 17.17 while the NM students mean score was 9.00, F (1, 17) = 6.93, p < .05.

Research question three: Are there differences between mainstreamed and not mainstreamed students on school related descriptive variables?

No differences were found between mainstreamed and not mainstreamed students on age at which the student became a focus of concern (FOC), number of schools attended, absences, or number of services received. There were no significant differences between the students based on ethnic group, F (1, 17) = .0075, p > .05 or intelligence (WISC), F (17, 1) = .070, p > .05. Results are reported in Tables 1 and 4.

Insert Table 4 about here

Research question four: Are there differences between how special education teachers and general education teachers rated the mainstreamed students on the measures of social competence?

There were no differences in how special education teachers and general education teachers rated the thirteen mainstreamed students on the W-M or the STL. There were no significant differences on the three main scores of the TRF (see Table 5). Out of the thirteen subscales of the TRF, one subscale showed a significant difference. The general education teachers rated the students higher on the Social Withdrawal subscale than did the special education teachers, $F(23, 1) = .019$, $p < .05$. The mainstreamed students received a mean score of 60.17 with a SD of 4.26 from the general education teachers and a mean score of 56.85 with a SD of 3.18 from the special education teachers.

Insert Table 5 about here

DISCUSSION

Overall, we found very few differences between students with behavior disorders who are mainstreamed and those who are not. These results were somewhat surprising. They may, however, reflect a problem with measurement rather than an indication of no real differences between the groups. At first glance, the lack of significance between the groups on the Walker-McConnel Adolescent Scale of Social Competence and School Adjustment. was surprising. The W-M has proven in the past to reliably identify students who are at risk for failing in mainstream settings. Upon closer examination, however, this is not surprising. The majority of the SBD students who were mainstreamed were not judged by their teachers as being successful either academically or socially. So, it is not really surprising that there was no difference between the two groups. W-M scores indicated both groups to be at risk.

We have come to conclude that using standardized measures are not the answer. We need to take a closer look at the decisions teachers are making. Why are some students mainstreamed and other are not? Our data do not reliably discriminate between the mainstreamed and non-mainstreamed students. Yet, some are chosen for mainstreaming and some are not. We need to discuss with both special and general education teachers why they feel some students are ready for mainstreaming and why some are successful and some are not. We need to talk with students -- those who are successful and those who are not. Success may be viewed from several perspectives including the teacher, the student with behavior disorders and his or her peers.

It is also imperative that we learn more about how students with behavior disorders are spending their time in mainstream classes. Ysseldyke and his colleagues, in a review of studies focusing on students with mild handicaps, determined that very little is actually known about the instructional arrangements teachers use for students with mild handicaps (Ysseldyke, Thurlow, Wotruba & Nania, 1991). Yet, special education teachers are expected to make decisions concerning placement and are frequently asked to work with classroom teachers to facilitate students' placements into mainstream classes. As a result, special education teachers must be aware of existing instructional arrangements for students in their mainstream classes. This will require a close examination of those environments utilizing data from a variety of sources.

References

Achenbach, T. M. & Edelbrock, C. (1983). Manual for the Child Behavior checklist and Revised Child Behavior Profile. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont.

Gable, R. A., Hendrickson, J. M. &Rutherford, R. B. (1991). Strategies for integrating students with behavioral disorders into general education. Monograph in Behavioral Disorders: Sever Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth (Vol. 14), Reston VA: Council for Exceptional Children

Kupersmidt, J. B., Patterson, C. J., & Griesler, P. C. (1988). Peer relations of children in special education. Paper presented at the NATO Advanced Study Institute On Social Competence in Developmental Perspective, Les Arcs, France.

Meadows, N. B., Neel, R. S., Scott, C. M., & Parker, G. M. (1991). Mainstreaming students with behavior disorders: A preliminary report. Seattle: Washington Institute for the Study of Social Behaviors.

Meadows, N. B., Neel, R. S., Scott, C.M., & Parker, G. M. (1991). A preliminary report: Mainstreaming students with behavior disorders. Seattle, WA: Washington Institute for the Study of Social Behaviors.

Neel, R. S., Meadows, N. B., & Scott, C. M. (1990). Determining social tasks: A preliminary report. Monograph in Behavioral Disorders: Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth (Vol. 13).Reston, VA: Council for Children With Behavior Disorders.

Neel, R., Meadows, N. & Scott, C. (1991) Determining social tasks: A preliminary report. Monograph in Behavioral Disorders. Behavioral Disorders..

Truesdell, L. A. (1988). Mainstreaming in an urban middle school: Effects of school organization and climate. The Urban Review, 20(1), 42-58.

Walker, H. M. & McConnell, S. R. (in press) The Walker-McConnell Scale of Social Competence and School Adjustment. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Walker, H. M. & Severson, H. (1991). School Archival Records Search (SARS). Longmont, CO: Sopris West, Inc.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., Wotruba, J. W., & Nania P. A. (1990). Instructional arrangements: Perceptions from general education. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22(4), 4-8.

APPENDIX J

SOCIAL COMPETENCY, MAINSTREAMING, AND CHILDREN WITH SERIOUS BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS

Social Competency, Mainstreaming, and Children with Serious Behavioral Disorders

Nancy B. Meadows

ABSTRACT

If we are to help students with serious behavioral disorders be more successful in mainstream classrooms, we need to use a model of instruction that reflects the child's needs and the demands of the environment. A proposed curriculum for teaching students social skills within social situations and tasks that are relevant to the mainstream setting and linked to social goals is discussed. Assessment of the impact of improved social competence on successful mainstreaming is discussed around the notions of environmental accommodations (changes made in the classroom) and assimilation (the incorporation of the child into the classroom setting).

Children with serious behavioral disorders are particularly at risk for social failure in mainstream settings. Observation studies have suggested that seriously behaviorally disordered students spend more time in solitary play and less time interacting socially with their peers (Walker & Rankin, 1983).

It has been well documented through the use of sociometric measures that the quality of peer relationships for seriously behaviorally disordered students is poor (Kupersmidt, Patterson, & Griesler, 1988; Sabornie & Kauffman, 1985; Semmel, Gottlieb, & Robinson, 1979). Sabornie and Kauffman (1985) assessed the sociometric status of seriously behaviorally disordered students in physical education classes and found that, in comparison to matched nonhandicapped cohorts, the seriously behaviorally disordered students were rated lower in sociometric status. Kupersmidt, Patterson, and Griesler (1988) compared the relative likelihood of peer rejection for students with behavioral disorders, learning disabilities, mental retardation, severe handicaps, and nonhandicapped students among grade-level peers. They found that students with behavioral disorders were three times more likely to be rejected than nonhandicapped students and twice as likely as students with learning disabilities or mental retardation.

Results from sociometric measures have led researchers to conclude that peer rejection may operate as a serious impediment to the successful integration of seriously behaviorally disordered students into mainstream settings (Lloyd, Kauffman, & Kupersmidt, in press). This should come as no surprise. Gresham reported in 1983 that our notions of mainstreaming were misguided — that merely placing handicapped students in environments with nonhandicapped students did not increase their social interactions with these students and did not increase the acceptance of handicapped students by their nonhandicapped peers. In a 1986 review of social skills research with students with behavioral disorders, Schloss and colleagues (Schloss, Schloss, Wood, & Kiehl, 1986) reported that researchers seldom demonstrate the social significance of any change in social competency and seldom assess the generalization effects to settings other than the training setting. The development of social

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

skills may be one of the most critical needs of students with behavioral disorders. This need appears to remain an issue even after these students are mainstreamed into general education classes.

As educators, one or our goals should be to enable students to develop and maintain social relationships throughout their educational experience. For students with behavioral disorders, the educational experience quite often includes both special and general education settings. Our attempts to facilitate the transition between general and special education settings includes teaching students various social skills. Intervention goals are selected on the basis of the general needs of students with behavioral disorders (Schloss et al., 1986). If the data reported in the literature are accurate, our current approaches to teaching social competency will have to be reevaluated and refined and new approaches explored. Along with improving our methods of instruction, we will need to examine how we assess the impact of improved social competency on the successful mainstreaming of seriously behaviorally disordered students into general education settings.

The purpose of this article is twofold. First, it will briefly describe the framework that a University of Washington research group is using to develop an instructional program for teaching social competency. Second, it will suggest that the impact of improved social competence be assessed using the notions of environmental accommodations (changes made in the classroom) and assimilation (the incorporation of the child into the classroom setting).

Instructing social competency is not a simple task, in part because social competency is a complex notion. Many researchers in education, psychology, and mental health have contributed to the tremendous increase in our knowledge of social competency. The current line of research of Neel and his colleagues (Neel, Jenkins, & Meadows, 1990; Neel, Meadows, & Scott, 1990) has focused on expanding Dodge's (1985) notion of social task. To summarize, these authors have hypothesized that social behavior includes a specific social context (setting, cast of persons, time frame, general situation), a social goal or outcome (e.g., attention, affiliation, acceptance, power), a social task (the problem a child faces when trying to achieve a social goal), and a behavior (social skills or a series of behaviors used in particular situations). Each element (context, task, behavior, and outcome) is an integral part of the complex notion of social behavior. The cornerstone of this concept is the belief that social behavior can be conceptualized as occurring in response to specific social tasks. Within this framework, a socially competent person would be one who achieved her/his desired social goal in a particular situation using social skills or behaviors judged as appropriate by others.

The social behavior model that has been described above provides some implications regarding the instruction of social competency. First, social skills need to be taught in the context of social tasks and situations that are relevant to children. Second, the social skills that are taught must meet children's social goals. This will require a closer examination of educational environments, the social tasks children face in these environments, and the behaviors they use when faced with these tasks, as well as children's social goals. An initial list of social tasks and situations generated by teachers, related service personnel, experts in the field of behavioral disorders, and students has been previously reported (Neel et al., 1990). These tasks and situations are thought to represent a subset of tasks and situations which might be problematic for socially incompetent children. Children's performances in these various situations may predict social competency in school settings. For a complete list of these social tasks and situations, the reader is referred to Neel, Meadows, and Scott (1990).

Describing the social tasks and situations that children face in school settings is only a first step. The social skills used by typically developing students will have to be identified. This research is currently underway. The results will provide us with information regarding the social skills required in various problematic social situations. These skills and behaviors will then serve as a basis for instruction. Children will be taught behaviors within the context of situations that are relevant to them and linked to their social goals. Our instructional objectives, then, would be directed toward teaching students to successfully negotiate a set of school-related tasks.

The process of designing an instructional curriculum includes first deciding what to teach and how to teach it, and then determining if that teaching has any effect. We have speculated as to what to teach (social competency) and how to teach it (new behaviors within relevant situations and tasks, linked to social goals or outcomes). We are left with the issue of assessing the impact of what is taught. How are we to assess the efficacy of our instruction? Can we determine whether an increase in social competency has an effect on successful mainstreaming? In order to answer these questions, we will need to take at least a brief look at the rather complex issue of mainstreaming.

Mainstreaming refers to the practice of integrating handicapped students socially and academically into general education settings as much as possible. Educators typically use the terms *mainstream setting* and *integrated setting* interchangeably. According to Webster's dictionary, integration is defined as "the organization of organic, psychological, or social traits and tendencies of a personality into a harmonious whole" and mainstreaming is defined as "placing a handicapped student in regular school classes." It is not this author's purpose to redefine either mainstreaming or integration but to incorporate both definitions in an effort to reframe how we look at mainstreaming and how we assess the impact of mainstreaming on children.

Typically, we attempt to facilitate mainstreaming by teaching children the social, academic, and/or study skills that teachers value (Gresham, 1983; Gresham & Elliott, 1988; Kerr & Zigmond, 1986) or by focusing on matching the handicapped child to the most effective environment by examining teacher expectations and tolerances, peer relationships, and student behavior (Lloyd et al., in press). A student is placed in a general education setting if s/he "fits in" academically and socially (Truesdale, 1988, 1990). Success is measured by how much the handicapped child is similar to her/his nonhandicapped cohort, measured by teacher ratings and naturalistic observations, or by how much the handicapped child is accepted by nonhandicapped peers, measured by sociometrics. Students exhibiting problem behaviors (academic or social) will remain in the general education setting if those behaviors can be changed or reduced using traditional methods and existing rules.

Currently, we mainstream those students who fit academically and socially into existing environments. Mainstreaming, however, should be based on the individual needs of the student, not just concern for the existing environment. Meeting the individual needs of students with behavioral disorders should include more than adapting the student to the environment; it should also include adapting the environment to meet individual needs. It is very possible

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that, in addition to instructing children to become more academically and/or socially competent, some environmental accommodations must be made. The view of mainstreaming purported by this author regards mainstreaming as a concept which incorporates the impact the child has on the environment, the extent to which the environment accommodates the needs of the handicapped student, and the extent to which the handicapped student is assimilated into the environment. Assessing whether a child is successful in a mainstream setting will include looking at the degree to which the child fits or is incorporated into the environment as well as any accommodations made for the child.

To determine whether an increase in social competency has an effect on successful mainstreaming, it is necessary to incorporate the notions of assimilation and accommodation discussed above into our assessment model. First, it is imperative that we establish that the child has acquired the skills necessary to negotiate successfully problematic social situations within the classroom. This may be accomplished through traditional measures such as role-plays, teacher rating scales, and direct observation. Next, we can explore the impact of social skills instruction on assimilation by asking whether the child's increased ability has resulted in an increased acceptance by the teacher and by peers. This may be assessed using traditional measures such as peer ratings and peer nominations, teacher ratings, and direct observation. At this point, we are concerned primarily with the degree to which the child is accepted by others in the mainstream classroom.

The model being discussed begins to differ from existing models, however, with the notion of assessing instructional accommodations in the classroom. It has been suggested by Ysseldyke, Thurlow, Wotruba, and Nania (1990) that we need to learn more about how students with handicaps are spending their time in mainstream classes. For students with behavioral disorders, this will require a close examination of the instructional accommodations general education teachers use for seriously behaviorally disordered students in mainstream settings. Accommodations may be academic ones such as curriculum adaptations or a change in curriculum materials, shortening the length of assignments, and/or lengthening time for assignments. Other accommodations may include a change in or an addition to a classroom behavior management system, and/or a change in instructional strategies such as the inclusion of peer tutoring or more individual seatwork.

In order to complete our assessment of the impact of improved social competency on the successful mainstreaming of seriously behaviorally disordered students, we need to ask two questions. Does the child's increased ability to successfully negotiate social situations alter a teacher's instructional style (e.g., more/less group instruction; more/less individual seatwork; more/less peer-assisted instruction? And does the child's increased ability in negotiating social situations impact a teacher's classroom management techniques (e.g., same/different class rules; same/different reinforcers; same/different self-management strategies)?

In conclusion, if we are to help children with serious behavioral disorders to be more successful in mainstream settings, it is imperative that we use a model of instruction that reflects the child's needs and the demands of the environment. The success of seriously behaviorally disordered students in integrated mainstream settings depends upon our ability to develop an instructional program to teach social competency and our ability to develop a system for assessing the impact of improved social competency. It is critical that we do not assume that seriously behaviorally disordered students who are mainstreamed are socially competent and no longer in need of instruction in that area. Future work is needed to develop a curriculum for instructing students in social competency that includes teaching students new social skills within relevant social situations and linked to social goals. Assessment is an integral and ongoing part of any instruction. Our future efforts in developing assessments to measure the impact of social skills instruction on successful mainstreaming will be framed around the degree to which the environment accommodates the individual needs of the child and the degree to which the child is assimilated into the mainstream integrated classroom setting.

REFERENCES

Dodge, K. A. (1985). Facets of social interaction and the assessment of social competence in children. In. B. H. Schneider, K. H. Rubin, & J. E. Ledingham (Eds.), *Children's peer relations: Issues in assessment and intervention* (pp. 3-22). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Gresham, F. M. (1983). Social validity in the assessment of children's social skills: Establishing standards for social competency. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 1,* 297-307.

Gresham, F. M., & Elliott, S. N. (1988). Teacher's social validity ratings of social skills: Comparisons between mildly handicapped and nonhandicapped children. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 6,* 225-234.

Kerr, M. M., & Zigmond, N. (1986). What do high school teachers want? A study of expectations and standards. *Education and Treatment of Children, 9,* 239-249.

Kupersmidt, J. B., Patterson, C. J., & Griesler, P. C. (1988). *Peer relations of children in special education.* Paper presented at the NATO Advanced Study Institute on Social Competence in Developmental Perspective, Les Arcs, France.

Lloyd, J. W., Kauffman, J. M., & Kupersmidt, J. B. (in press). Success of students with behavior disorders in regular education environments: A review of research and a systemic model for development of intervention. In K. Gadow (Ed.), *Advances in learning and behavioral disabilities* (Vol. 8). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Neel, R. S., Jenkins, Z. N., & Meadows, N. B. (1990). Social problem-solving behaviors and aggression in young children: A descriptive observational study. *Behavioral Disorders, 16,* 39-51.

Neel, R. S., Meadows, N. B., & Scott, C. M. (1990). Determining social tasks: A preliminary report. In R. B. Rutherford, Jr. & S. A. DiGangi (Eds.), *Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth (Vol. 13, pp. 38-46).* Reston, VA: Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.

Sabornie, E. J., & Kauffman, J. M. (1985). Regular classroom sociometric status of behaviorally disordered adolescents *Behavioral Disorders, 10,* 268-274.

Schloss, P. J., Schloss, C. N., Wood, C. E., & Kiehl, W. S. (1986). A critical review of social skills research with behaviorally disordered students. *Behavioral Disorders, 12,* 1-14.

Semmel, M. I., Gottlieb, J., & Robinson, N. M. (1979). Mainstreaming: Perspectives on educating handicapped children in the public school. In D. C. Berliner (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 3). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Truesdell, L. A. (1988). Mainstreaming in an urban middle school: Effects of school organization and climate. *Urban Review, 20,* 42-58.

Truesdell, L. A. (1990). Behavior and achievement of mainstreamed junior high special class students. *Journal of Special Education, 24,* 234-245.

Walker, H. M., & Rankin, R. (1983). Assessing the behavioral expectations and demands of less restrictive settings. *School Psychology Review, 12,* 274-284.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., Wotruba, J. W., & Nania, P. A. (1990). Instructional arrangements: Perceptions from general education. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 22*(4), 4-8.

Nancy B. Meadows, Assistant Professor of Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Texas Christian University, P.O. Box 32925, Fort Worth, Texas 76129

APPENDIX K

INVESTIGATING THE MAINSTREAM ENVIRONMENTS OF STUDENTS WITH BEHAVIOR DISORDERS

Investigating the Mainstream Environments of Students with Behavior Disorders

The goal of any educational program is to prepare students to lead successful lives during their school years and following graduation. Since the passage of P.L. 94-142, the educational experience for students with learning and behavior problems has included both general and special education settings. Integrating students with handicaps socially and academically into general education settings is a practice educators call mainstreaming. Typically, we attempt to facilitate mainstreaming by teaching children the social, academic and/or study skills that teachers value (Gresham, 1983; Gresham & Elliot, 1988; Kerr & Zigmond, 1986; Meadows, in press), or by focusing on matching the handicapped child to the most effective environment by examining teacher expectations and tolerances, peer relationships and student behavior (Lloyd, Kauffman & Kupersmidt, 1988). In either case, we typically mainstream those students who fit academically and socially into existing environments.

A child is considered successful in the mainstream classroom if s/he remain in the class with little or no support from the special education teacher (Truesdale, 1990). Students exhibiting problem behaviors (academic or social) will remain in their mainstream general education setting if those behaviors can be changed or reduced using traditional methods and existing rules (Meadows, in press). The degree to which a child is successful is usually measured by how much the handicapped child is similar to his or her non-handicapped cohort (measured by teacher ratings and naturalistic observation) or by how much the handicapped child is accepted by non-handicapped peers (measured by sociometrics).

Currently we mainstream students with learning and emotional problems into existing settings where they have the highest probability of success. Mainstreaming, however, should be based on the individual needs of the student, not just concern for the existing environment. Meeting the individual needs of students with learning and/or emotional problems should include more than adapting the student to the environment; it should also include adapting the classroom environment to meet student's needs. It is very possible that, in addition to instructing children to become more academically and/or socially competent, some classroom accommodations must be made. Accommodations for students with learning disabilities may be academic ones such as curricular adaptations or a change in curricular materials, shortening the length of assignments, and.or lengthening time for assignments. Accommodations for students whose primary disability is emotional disturbance may include a change in or an addition to a classroom behavior management system, and/or a change in instructional strategies such as the inclusion of peer tutoring or more individual seatwork.

Preliminary data indicate that teachers seldom make academic or social changes to accommodate the needs of handicapped students (Ysseldyke, Thurlow, Wotruba & Nania, 1990; Meadows, Neel, Scott, & Parker, 1991). Ysselldyke and his colleagues argue that, in fact, very little is actually known about the instructional arrangements teachers use for students with mild handicaps in general education settings. Yet, special educators are frequently asked to work with classroom teachers to facilitate students' placements into mainstream classrooms. As a result, special educators must be aware of existing instructional arrangements for students with mild handicaps in their mainstream classes. This will require a close examination of those environments and the instructional accommodations general education teachers use for students with mild learning and behavioral handicaps.

The philosophy underlying this proposed study regards mainstreaming as a concept which incorporates the impact the child has on the classroom environment, the extent to which the environment accommodates the needs of the handicapped student, and the extent to which the handicapped student is integrated into the classroom. Assessing whether a child is successful in a mainstream setting will include looking at the degree to which the child fits or is incorporated into the classroom environment as well as any accommodations made for the child. Success may be viewed from several perspectives including the teacher, the mildly handicapped student, and his or her peers. In our determination of whether a child is successful in any given setting, it is important to gather information from a variety of sources.

Before we are able to adequately measure the success of mildly handicapped children in mainstream settings, it is imperative that we learn more about how these students are spending their time in mainstream classes. Objectives for this study included: (a) determine what accommodations are currently being made for students with behavioral disorders n general education classrooms; and(b) determining whether teachers perceive students with behavior disorders as being academically and socially successful in general education classrooms. Results from this study provide important first steps toward preparing both teachers and students for successful mainstream experiences.

Based on the discussion above, the following research question was posed:

What accommodations (academic, instructional, social) are made for students with behavior disorders in general education classrooms?

Methods

Subjects. Teachers participating in this study were from an urban school district in a metropolitan area in the Pacific Northwest. Subjects included 13 middle school general education teachers who have one or more students with serious behavior disorders in their content area classes at least one hour a day. Content area classes included Science, Social Studies, English, Math, Physical Education and Art. Teachers were chosen because they were the mainstream teachers of 19 students who had been participating in an ongoing research study on social skills. The 13 teachers participating in this study represent the mainstream teachers of the 19 SBD students. All teachers agreed to participate. Parents had previously given permission for teachers and students to be contacted.

General Procedures. Teachers were asked to complete a survey which gave direct feedback as to ways in which the teacher modified or altered curriculum, assignments, tests and/or classroom rules in order to meet the needs of students with serious behavior disorders. They were also asked to give their perceptions as to how successful these students were in their classrooms. A copy of the survey can be found in the Appendix.

Results

Descriptive statistics were used to characterize the data; a summary of results are reported in Table 1. The majority of teachers used the same curricula with all students and used the same criteria to evaluate all students. When asked about test modifications, 57% indicated that they did alter the way in which tests were given to students with behavior disorders. The same pattern appeared when responses to instructional accommodations were analyzed; the majority of teachers used the same instructional techniques in classes with and without students with behavior disorders. The same trend appeared when looking at behavior management techniques; 79% of teachers surveyed reported using the same behavior management techniques for all students. Only 10% of teachers reported receiving assistance for academic planning; less than half of the teachers reported receiving assistance for behavior problems. However, 26% of teachers reported that they would like to receive more assistance with behavior and/or academic planning. Teachers reported that approximately half (53%) of the students got along well with their peers; 47% were reported as not getting along well with their peers. Academically, 52% of the students were reported as making a "C" or below; teachers failed to report the academic progress of 36% of the students.

--Insert Table 1 About Here--

Discussion

If we are to be successful in our efforts to mainstream students with emotional and behavior problems, our focus must be two-fold -- teaching the teacher strategies for accommodating the needs of mildly handicapped students and teaching children the academic and social behaviors necessary to be successful in mainstream settings. Results from this study have provided important first steps toward that goal. These first steps include finding out how students with behavior problems are currently spending their time in mainstream classes. Additional research is also needed in order to focus on those students who are experiencing success as well as those who are failing. Too often we focus on the child who is failing without studying and observing the child who is successful. What accommodations are made which facilitate success? What behaviors or strategies do successful students use? It is possible for us to learn from successful students and teachers and to incorporate their strategies into a remediation program.

Results from this study have provided interesting, but limited information, about some of the practices used by teachers of mainstreamed students. Further research needs to be directed toward determining the impact different academic, instructional and classroom management strategies have on the success of mainstreamed students. Can we facilitate mainstreaming for students with behavior disorders by adapting the environment while at the same time teaching students new, more appropriate behaviors and learning strategies? In a discussion concerning children with behavioral and emotional problems, Lloyd and his colleagues (Lloyd et.al., 1988) express the hope that "our future work and that of others will lead to more comprehensive and coordinated interventions that will allow a greater proportion of students with behavior disorders to be successful in their regular classrooms (p. 255)." It is the hope of this author that results from this study will provide some contribution to current and future work in mainstreaming.

Table 1: Summary of Accommodations Made for SBD Students in Mainstream Classes

Academic Accommodations	
94%	use same curricula, assignments, and tests
57%	modify how tests are given e.g. more time, read aloud
89%	use same criteria to evaluate work
Instructional Accommodations	
32%	offer more peer and/or teacher assisted time
68%	have not changed instructional style
89%	use same techniques in classes w/o SBD students
Instructional techniques used:	
63%	peer tutoring
26%	learning centers
52%	group projects
68%	cooperative learning
53%	seatwork
47%	teacher directed discussions
58%	lecture
84%	demonstration modeling
68%	direct instruction
Management Accommodations	
79%	use same management techniques
95%	have same rules for all students
53%	report SBD students get along well with others
47%	report students do not get along well with others
26%	create opportunities for students wot work with peers
Levels of Assistance	
10%	receive assistance with academic planning
42%	receive assistance with behavior management
26%	want more help with behavior and academics
Current student grades: (N=19)	
21%	Failing
10%	D's
21%	C's
10%	B's
36%	no report

References

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte. (1984). Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research. Orlando,FL: Academic Press.

Gresham, F. M. (1983). Social validity in the assessment of children's social skills: Establishing standards for social competency. Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 1, 297-307.

Gresham, F. M. & Elliot, S. N. (1988). Teacher's social validity ratings of social skills: comparisons between mildly handicapped and nonhandicapped children. Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 6, 225-234.

Kerr, M. M. & Zigmond, N. (1986). What do high school teachers want? A study of expectations and standards. Education and Treatment of Children, 9, 239-249.

Lloyd, J. W., Kauffman, J. M., & Kupersmidt, J. B. (1988). Success of students with behavior disorders in regular education environments: A review of research and a systemic model for development of interventions. In K. Gadow (Ed.), Advances in Learning and Behavioral Disabilities (Vol. 8). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Meadows, N. B. (in press). Social competency, mainstreaming and children with behavior disorders. In R. Rutherford (Ed.), Monograph in Behavioral Disorders: Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth (Vol. 13). Reston, VA: Council for Children with Behavior Disorders.

Meadows, N. B., Neel, R. S., & Parker, G. M., & Timo, K. (1991). A validation of social skills for students with behavior disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 16(3), 200-210.

Meadows, N. B., Neel, R. S., Scott, C.M., & Parker, G. M. (1991). A preliminary report: Mainstreaming students with behavior disorders. Seattle, WA: Washington Institute for the Study of Social Behaviors.

Truesdell, L. A. (1990). Behavior and achievement of mainstreamed junior high special class students. The Journal of Special Education, 24(2), 234-245.

Williams, S. L., Walker, H. M., Holmes, D., Todis, B., & Fabre, T. R. (1989). Social validation of adolescent social skills by teacher and students. Remedial and Special Education, 10(4), 18-27

Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., Wotruba, J. W., & Nania, P. A. (1990). Instructional arrangements: Perceptions from general education. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22(4), 4-8.

APPENDIX L

MAINSTREAM ENVIRONMENTS OF STUDENTS WITH SERIOUS BEHAVIOR DISORDERS (SBD)

Mainstream Environments of Students with Serious Behavior Disorders (SBD)

Teacher's Name ______________________________________

Student's Name ______________________________________

Subject Area ______________________________________

Class Size _________ Mainstreamed ______

General Ed ______

Interview Questions: General Education Teachers

Curriculum/Assignments

1. Is the student using the same curriculum materials as the rest of the class?

_____ Yes _____ No

   a. If yes, what materials are used?

   b. If no, how is material different?

2. Does the student receive the same daily assignments as the rest of the class?

_____ Yes _____ No

   a. If yes, what are some examples of assignments given?

   b. If no, how are assignments modified?

      _____ 1. time allowed for completion?

      _____ 2. length of assignment?

      _____ 3. other?

      ____

      ____

3. Does the student receive the same homework assignments as the rest of the class?

_____ Yes _____ No

a. If yes, please give some examples of the types of homework assignments given.

b. If no, how are they modified?

_____ 1. time allowed for completion

_____ 2. length of assignment

_____ 3. other

____

4. Does the student take the same test as other students?

_____ Yes _____ No

a. If yes, are there any modifications?

_____ 1. more time?

_____ 2. read aloud?

_____ 3. other?

____

____

b. If no, how does test differ?

5. Is the student's performance evaluated using the same criteria as other students in class on their

a. daily assignments?

_____ Yes _____ No

b. homework assignments?

_____ Yes _____ No

c. tests/quizzes?

_____ Yes _____ No

6. If the student's performance is judged using a different criteria, how does criteria differ from other students?

Instructional Strategies

7. Have you changed your instructional style for this student?

_____ a. more individual seatwork

_____ b. less individual seatwork

_____ c. more group work time

_____ d. less group work time

_____ e. more teacher assisted time

_____ f. less teacher assisted time

_____ g. more peer assisted time

_____ h. less peer assisted time

_____ i. other

____

8. If you were to compare this class with any one of your other classes, is your instructional style different because you have a mainstreamed SBD student?

_____ Yes _____ No

a. If yes, how?

b. If no, are there any changes you would like to make?

9. What specific instructional strategies do you use in this class?

_____ a. peer tutoring?

_____ b. learning centers?

_____ c. group projects?

_____ d. cooperative learning?

_____ e. individual seat work?

_____ f. teacher-directed discussions?

_____ g. lecture?

_____ h. demonstration/modeling?

_____ i. other

____

10. Do you use the same instyructional strategies in your classes that do not have an SBD student?

_____ Yes _____ No

a. If no, how does your instructional style differ

Classroom Management

11. Are your classroom management strategies the same in this class as others without a SBD student?

_____ Yes _____ No

12. What are your classroom rules? (Please list or attach a copy.)

13. Are your rules the same for this student as others in your class?

_____ Yes _____ No

a. If no, how do the rules differ for this student?

14. Have you changed any classroom rules since this student has been in your class?

_____ Yes _____ No

a. If yes, what changes have you made?

15. Overall, does this student get along well with the other students in this class?

_____ Yes _____ No

16. Specifically, does this student get along well with other students in

a. academic groups?

_____ Yes _____ No

b. social -- structured time?

_____ Yes _____ No

c. social -- unstructured time

_____ Yes _____ No

17. Is it necessary for you to look for or create opportunities for this student to work with others in the class?

_____ Yes _____ No

a. If yes, how do you accomplish this?

Support Services

18. Does this student's special education teacher provide assistance with

a. academic/instructional planning

_____ Yes _____ No

b. behavior management

_____ Yes _____ No

c. other ______________________________

_____ Yes _____ No

19. Do you receive assistance from anyone else regarding this student?

_____ Yes _____ No

a. If yes, who provides support?

____

____

b. If no, would you like assistance with academic planning?

_____ Yes _____ No

c. with behavior management?

_____ Yes _____ No

COMMENTS

THANKS SO MUCH FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

APPENDIX M

REPLACEMENT BEHAVIORS:

A STRATEGY FOR TEACHING SOCIAL SKILLS TO CHILDREN WITH BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS

Replacement behaviors: A strategy for teaching social skills to children with behavior problems

Richard S. Neel
University of Washington

K. Kay Cessna
Colorado State Department of Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Children with behavior problems often act in ways that are frustrating to teachers. In rural schools, where the diversity of educational needs teachers are required to manage is large, problem behaviors can be especially challenging. As a teacher, one of our jobs is to teach children how to act at school. Many of the children we teach, however, bring to school a wide range of attitudes and behaviors that often cause problems. A difficult task for all of us is to respond to these behaviors in positive ways. As a preschool teacher, you are familiar with teaching children how to get along. It is a major portion of the preschool curriculum. Teaching alternatives to problem behaviors, however, is different from anything else that you teach. Most of the lessons you prepare are planned, implemented, and controlled by you. Behavior problems, on the other hand , are rarely scheduled. They occur whenever a child wishes to bring them up. Many young children are already adept at choosing the "right" form of behavior to use to disrupt a class or get that special toy away from another child. It is not uncommon, for example, to find a four year old who has mastered the art of intimidation and control. When a problem behavior occurs, the teacher and other children usually respond, giving the child undue control of the situation. It is no wonder that teachers feel reactive, not in charge.

Problems become things that teachers want to control or erase. To be sure, problem behaviors do compete with academic instruction. As teachers, we often think that when we have to attend to these problem behaviors we are prevented from providing more important academic instruction, or that we are giving too much time to one child and ignoring the needs of the other children. Additionally, they often make teachers feel that the classroom is out of control. Most programs that have been developed for dealing with problem behaviors support these notions by focusing on reducing or eliminating these behaviors. It is our view that if teachers are going to be expected to effectively deal with the wide range of social behavior present in rural schools, and if they are going to try to integrate social skills training into their already crowded curriculum, new methods of designing instruction need to be developed. These new programs must be ones that can be effectively implemented in classrooms.

This paper describes an instructional system that allows teachers to develop instruction for changing problem behaviors. This differentiated programming process is based upon several assumptions. First, behavioral problems are best addressed through instruction, not control. Second, the myriad of interactions between children and teachers in a school day are the primary instructional arenas for teaching social behaviors. And finally, problem behaviors are not fundamentally different from acceptable ones. They seek the same social ends as their desired counterparts. The primary difference lies in the desirability of the form (behavior) selected rather than the outcome (intent) achieved. The purpose of this paper is to present our current understanding of a method of dealing with problem behaviors that is instructional in nature, and to solicit input from the field on how this process could be improved. As in all processes, the products presented here are in a state of perpetual draft.

Behavior is something to teach, not control

Cessna and Adams (1989) have identified the critical components of instruction for handicapped children in schools: differentiated academics, life skills, and developmental/compensatory instruction. For preschool children, differentiated academics are the adjustments we make in teaching content subjects to accommodate various handicapping conditions of children in our classroom. For children with language delays, it might be the use of a language rich approach. For children with more serious delays, it might involve direct instruction of various academic and cognitive skills in a variety of settings. Life-management instruction involves learning those skills required to effectively manage yourself in home, community, work, and school environments. For most preschool children, these activities take up a majority of the day. Children with handicaps are taught how to organize their work, adjust to the demands of various settings, and interact with teachers and peers. Developmental/compensatory instruction focuses on helping children develop previously undeveloped skills or teaching them ways to compensate for their disability. For most children with handicaps in a preschool class, developmental/compensatory instruction focuses on alleviating a problem or mitigating the negative effects of a handicap. Children with visual impairments are taught how to get around; children with hearing loss are taught how to communicate with their hands. For children with behavior problems, developmental/compensatory instruction involves teaching children to be socially competent in a variety of settings and situations. In other words, teaching them to learn how to get their social needs met in ways that are more acceptable to others.

A central question in providing an appropriate education for children with behavior problems is deciding which developmental/compensatory skills need to be taught. In other words, how do we make *instructional* sense of the problem behaviors we see? To answer this question, two concepts need to be introduced: behavioral intent and replacement behaviors.

Behavioral intent is the functional relationship between the behaviors we observe and the outcome achieved by the child. When a child acts, even with behaviors that we view as disordered, s/he acts to achieve a result. This desired result or outcome can be viewed as the intent of (purpose for) the behavior. Determining the intent of a behavior is more complicated than describing the problem. It requires that you discover the connection between the behavior you observe and the result that behavior achieves **for the child**.

Often the intent is not readily apparent. For example, a common complaint among teachers is that children often argue when asked to do something. When asked what the problem is, teachers often report that, "He always argues with me when I tell him to .... (sit down, stop talking, line up, get ready for the bus, etc.). "What would you like him to do?" "Well, I just want him to stop arguing!" (or stated in a positive format, "I want him to follow directions!"). Programs are then set up to reward following directions and punish (or at least not reward) arguing. The problem with this approach is that it assumes that the intent desired by the teacher, in this case approval through compliance with instructions, is the same one desired by the child. Far too often, this is not the case. For many children who argue, the desired intent is connection or control. These children argue because it works. They use problem behaviors that produce consistent responses in others. This consistency seems to be more rewarding than the apparent punishing effects of being yelled at or continuing to argue. Assume for a minute that our "problem child" was arguing because it was the only reliable way they had to control the situation. If s/he (it seems to be "he" 4 times as often as girls) were to agree to follow directions, what effect would that produce? It is likely that teacher contact would be less, and, from the child's point of view, he would be waiting for the next event (command) to occur. This uncertainty is too great for some children, and it often produces a situation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

where commands are met with arguments because arguments are "known events" to the child. They know how to handle an argument (they have had thousands of them), and it is easier to argue than deal with the lack of control implied by complying with the teacher's request. If, on the other hand, our child was seeking attention from the teacher, a similar result would occur. Again, following directions is more likely to reduce attention not increase it, and arguing would be a more effective way of obtaining attention. In other words, the child acts in ways that get his/her needs met

Discovering the intent of a behavior is essential if we are to plan effective programs for meeting children's needs. It is, of course, an inferred intent, similar to the communicative intent of pragmatics in language. An important feature for instruction is the connection between the inferred outcome and observed events. One example of how intent can be used to explain behavior is Wahler and Dumas' (1986) work with abusive families. They showed that consistency was the reward that controlled aggressive behavior in family members who were being abused. For our purposes here, the important element is that problem behaviors are indicators of intent, and that this intent can be discerned from problem behaviors. Once the behavioral intent has been determined, replacement behaviors need to be taught that will achieve the desired outcome for the child.

Replacement behaviors. The concept of replacement behaviors is based upon two assumptions. First, behavior is purposeful and achieves a desired outcome for the child. In fact, it is the reinforcement received by reaching this outcome that shapes the specific behavior (form) used by the child. Second, outcomes sought by children with behavior problems are not pathological. Using replacement behaviors as an instructional philosophy assumes that everyone has needs for control, and that this need is not inherently wrong. Rather, the problem is that the behavior(s) used to gain that control are not pleasant for others. To solve the problem, we do not deny the needs; rather, we teach more effective ways to achieve them. Problem behaviors are no longer triggers for interventions designed to reduce or eliminate their presence. Instruction focuses on teaching a child more appropriate behaviors to use in various situations to achieve the same behavioral intent. In other words, they are new behaviors that the child can substitute for problem ones yet still reliably achieve his/her desired outcome. It is important to remember that a newly learned behavior is only a replacement behavior if it achieves the same outcome for the child.

Returning to our example of the child who argues to gain control over the situation, the instructional goal of following directions would only be a replacement for arguing if it allowed the child to maintain (gain) control of the situation. In most classrooms, this would not be allowed. In fact, inherent in teaching a child to follow directions is the notion of switching control from the child to the teacher. Examples of potential replacement behaviors would include teaching the child to make choices, develop alternate activities, develop self-management skills, negotiate, and, of course, ultimately develop tolerance for doing things you did not want to do (e.g., accepting the control of others). Each of these examples suggest a different focus of instruction. Instructional goals shift from eliminating an argument to getting the child to develop a more reasoned, and ultimately balanced, approach to the need for security and certainty.

If we are to effectively teach how to develop appropriate ways to get what they need, we have to first acknowledge that the child's needs are legitimate and then teach behaviors that are more appropriate while maintaining the outcome for the child. When we acknowledge the legitimacy of the intent for each child, we develop an instructional approach that allows us to adjust our teaching to accommodate the changing needs of our children. Behavior problems become a diagnostic tool that indicates the current level of the child's need. This needs-based focus of instruction is a necessary step in designing appropriate social instruction for children with handicaps in preschool classrooms. Without it, the teacher is caught in a feeling of always responding to problems rather than teaching. Constantly putting out fires is not only unrewarding in the short term, it is often ineffective in the long term. With the use of replacement behaviors and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

behavioral intent, we can turn what appears to be chaos into planned instruction, with goals, objectives, and even IEPs!

Analyzing outcome: The first step

Teachers often fail to view problem behavior as an instructional task involving replacing forms of behavior. They tend to focus on reducing the behavior or substituting a behavior that will achieve a *different* outcome. For example, many programs focus on punishing a particular behavior (eg., sending a child to a corner when they fail to follow a rule) and/or rewarding a behavior that competes effectively with the problem one (e.g., points for playing a game or praise for sharing a toy). Other times, teachers design lessons that try to prevent the problem from occurring. Rules are relaxed to prevent frustration, praise is given at a high rate, and lessons are simplified to avoid vagueness and ambiguity. When the number of problem behaviors reduces, the program is viewed as a success. In many of these cases, the validity of the inferred behavioral intent is denied. For example, if a child cried when frustrated, the instruction should teach how to learn to be frustrated appropriately, not try to eliminate frustration. The curriculum for children with behavior problems (and we would argue the same for all children) must originate from the child. Teachers need to keep their instruction focused on effectively replacing problem behaviors with ones that are more socially acceptable while keeping intended outcomes intact. Only when we accept that problem behaviors presented by the child as diagnostic data for needed instruction will we be able to make sense out of them. A list of possible outcomes sought by children through problem behaviors is shown at the end of this paper.

The importance of analyzing the outcome of a series of behaviors cannot be overemphasized. Without accurate knowledge of the outcome achieved, it is likely that the instructional intervention designed will be at best ineffective, and at worst will contribute to creating a more severe problem. Running away from the group illustrates the importance of outcome analysis as the first step in teaching replacement behaviors. A child could run away from a group for several reasons (intents). For example, s/he could be going to someplace else that could be viewed as more fun, s/he could be escaping an unpleasant event in the group (too hard of a task, unpleasant neighbor, correction by the teacher, etc.), or s/he could enjoy the attention (and some would say power) achieved by engaging in the game called "teacher chase". There are an equal number of responses a teacher could make to a child that runs away. S/he could chase after the child, scold the child, direct the child to another task, sit down and talk to the child about the danger of running away, ignore the child, or distract the child by paying attention to others in the class. Which technique should the teacher use? We would suggest that it depends upon the outcome the child achieves from the behavior. For example, if the outcome was to gain attention, then scolding and discussing the dangers of running away are not the technique of choice. (They both give attention to the child and therefore reinforce the problem behavior.) If, however, the child is trying to escape a problem situation, then sitting down and talking with her/him might be just the right thing to do. By analyzing the intent of the behavior, we can determine which set of replacement behaviors to teach. Remember, the presence of behavior in and of itself legitimizes the need for teaching ways to achieve the desired outcome. Focusing on determining the intent and then selecting appropriate replacement behaviors allows the curriculum to be driven by the instructional needs of the child. It becomes a truly individualized program based on the ever changing social needs of the child.

Outcome Analysis Worksheet: A draft

We end this article with a list of steps you can use to analyze a series of behaviors to determine its behavioral intent (outcome). This process is in a draft form. As we collect more information on its use, we will continue to refine the process. We offer it here as our best thinking to the moment. Use it as a guide. Modify it to fit your classroom and particular situation whenever it feels appropriate. If you have suggestions and/or comments, please forward them to us. We are interested in your experience and insight.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Step 1: Select a problem and describe it in your own words. This may be a running narrative or a brief description of the problem.

Step 2: Select a recent incident when the problem occurred. Each incident should include the problem behavior, the people involved, any particular activity or instruction that was going on, and what the child and others did until the event ended.

Step 3: After you have described the first incident, see if you can remember other incidents where the problem occurs. If you cannot remember the particulars of one or more of the incidents listed (eg., who was there, what was the activity, or how did the incident end) gather the needed information to complete it (them). You may have to wait until the problem reoccurs to get a full picture, but be patient. The rewards in ease of instructional planning will make the effort worth it.

Step 4: After you have described several incidents, list the probable outcome (intent) the child achieved in *each* incident. (Use accompanying definition sheet as a guide.) If you are unsure of the outcome, list the last thing that happened in the incident.

Step 5: If you have listed more than one outcome from the incidents you have described, select the one that you feel is most important to change first.

Step 6: List a set of replacement behaviors you want to teach for the outcome selected. This becomes the set of behaviors you will teach as part of your instructional program.

Step 7: Repeat this process for each of the problem behaviors you observed. If different problem behaviors achieve the same outcome for a child, then you can use the same replacement behaviors you were teaching for the other problem behavior. Our experience is that you will have fewer outcomes than you would first expect.

This article has outlined a way of analyzing problem behaviors to determine the outcome achieved by that behavior and it has suggested a method of using that information to plan social instruction for pre-school children. In schools where resources are scarce and the diversity of educational challenges are great, it is necessary to develop educational techniques that will address that diversity in an efficient manner. Social programs that deal with each problem behavior as an independent lesson are rather inefficient if not impossible. Programs that focus on determining critical outcomes and the teaching of replacement behaviors offer a viable alternative.

OUTCOME	DESCRIPTION
Power/Control	When child seeks control of events and/or situations. Characterized by child acting to stay in situation and keep control of events.
Protection/Escape/ Avoidance	When child seeks to avoid a task, activity; escape a consequence; terminate or leave a situation. When a child seeks to avoid danger, pain, or uncomfortable situations or events.
Attention	When a child becomes the focus of a situation; draws attention to self; result is the child puts herself/himself in the foreground of a situation; discriminates self from group for a period of time; distinguishing feature is that of becoming the focus as the end product of the behavior.
Acceptance/Affiliation	Child seeks to connect/relate with others; mutuality of benefit is present.
Expression of self	Child seeks forum of expression; could be statement of needs or perceptions; demonstration of skills and talents.
Gratification	Child seeks self-reward/enjoyment. Distinguishing characteristics is self-directed; others may play agent role, but self-reward/enjoyment is central outcome of activity.
Justice/revenge	Child seeks settlement of difference; restitution or contrition are usually involved; settling the score.

REFERENCES

Cessna, K., & Adams, L. (1989). Expanded curricula for needs based instruction. Unpublished manuscript. Denver, Colorado: Colorado Department of Education.

Wahler, R. G., & Dumas, J. E. (1986). "A chip off the old block:" Some interpersonal characteristics of coercive children across generations. (P. 49-140) In Children's Social Behavior: Development, Assessment, and Modification. P. S. Strain, M. J. Guralnick, & H. M. Walker (Eds.). Orlando, FL: Academic Press, Inc.

APPENDIX N

SOCIAL SKILLS TRAINING

Social Skills Training:

Day 1: Interview

Day 2: Model behaviors
Rehearsal
Coaching

Day 3: Role-play situations
Coaching
Feedback

Day 4: Role play situations
Feedback

Day 5: Generate new situations
Role-play situations
Feedback

Social Skills Training Checklist

Day 1 _____ Validate tasks
_____ Generate Situations
_____ Generate behaviors

Day 2 _____ Model behaviors
_____ Rehearse behaviors
_____ Coaching

Day 3 _____ Role-play situations (Teacher with Student)
_____ Coaching
_____ Feedback (By Teacher)
_____ Feedback (By Students)

Day 4 _____ Role-play situations (Students)
_____ Feedback (Teacher)
_____ Feedback (Students)

Day 5 _____ Generate new situations
_____ Role-play situations (Students)
_____ Feedback (Students)
_____ Feedback (Teacher)

Social Skills Training Overview

Day 1: The purpose of this session is to identify the problem and generate a menu of situations and behaviors to use in following sessions. The teacher will use an interview format, asking students to generate situations and behaviors. The interviews will be audiotaped so that the teacher will have a record of situations and behaviors to use in following sessions.

Interview format:

(T) Sometimes students have to deal with being provoked by another student? Does this ever happen to you?

(T) Pick a time when this has happened to you and tell me about it. where were you and what happened?

(T) What did you do or say?

(T) How did that work?

(T) what else could you have done in that situation?

(T) How do you think that would have worked?

Day 2: The purpose of this session is to model the behaviors generated during Day 1. The teacher may also suggest alternative behaviors. If the students agree that they would actually use that behavior, the teacher then models the behavior. After the teacher has modeled the behaviors, the students practice. The teacher will coach students when necessary.

MODELING GUIDELINES

1. At least two examples of different situations for each demonstration of a skill should be used. If a given skill is taught in more than one group meeting, two more new modeling displays should be developed.
2. Situations that are relevant to the trainees' real-life circumstances should be selected
3. The main actor--that is, the person enacting the behavioral steps of the skill--should be portrayed as a person reasonably similar to the people in the Interpersonal Skills Training group in age, socioeconomic background, verbal ability and other salient characteristics.
4. Modeling displays should depict only one skill at a time. All extraneous content should be eliminated.
5. All modeling displays should depict all the behavioral steps of the skill being modeled in the correct sequence.
6. All displays should depict positive outcomes. Displays should always end with reinforcement to the model.

COACHING GUIDELINES

1. Provide instruction of concepts, rules, behaviors
2. Provide opportunity for practicing or rehearsing behaviors
3. Provide performance feedback on new learning

Day 3: The purpose of Session 3 is to allow students to role-play the behaviors, using the situations they generated during the interviews in Session 1. the role-plays will be between teacher and student, with the teacher playing the part of the student doing the provoking. If necessary, the teacher will stop the student during the role-play and provide coaching. After completing the role-play, the other students in the group will be asked to give feedback. the teacher will give her feedback after the students.

ROLE PLAY GUIDELINES

1. Prior to role-play, students have practiced behaviors
2. Vignettes are realistic
3. Attention is focused on the problematic situation
4. The trainer describes the scene/situation, then prompts the student as to "what would you do next?"
5. Following role-play, students and teacher provide feedback.

PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK GUIDELINES

1. Provide reinforcement only after role plays that follow the behavioral steps.
2. Provide reinforcement at the earliest appropriate opportunity after role plays that follow the behavioral steps.
3. Vary the specific content of the reinforcements offered -- for example, praise particular aspects of the performance such as tone of voice, posture, phrasing, etc.
4. Provide enough role-playing activity for each group member to have sufficient opportunity to be reinforced.
5. Provide reinforcement in an amount consistent with the quality of the given role play.
6. Provide no reinforcement when the role play departs significantly from the behavioral steps (except for "trying" in the first session or two).
7. Provide reinforcement for an individual trainee's improvement over previous performances.

8. Always provide reinforcement to the co-actor for being helpful, cooperative, etc.

Day 4: The purpose of this session is to allow students to role-play with each other. Students and the teacher will provide feedback following each role-play.

Day 5: The purpose of this last session is to allow the students to generate new situations. they will be asked to recall situations during the past week when they have been provoked. Students will role-play these situations and feed back will be given as it was during Sessions 3 and 4.

APPENDIX O

MAYBE THIS BEHAVIOR DOES MAKE SENSE

Maybe This Behavior Does Make Sense

Richard S. Neel and K. Kay Cessna

Children with behavior problems often act in ways that are frustrating to teachers. Why? According to the second author, it is because they did not go to the same methods class that teachers did. A cursory look at the differences between academic instruction and "behavior problems" highlights some of the sources of frustration. Academic instruction is scheduled by the teacher. The materials are selected and presented in a planned manner. Attention is given to what is presented, how the children respond, and correction is given when necessary. In sum, the teaching process is controlled by the teacher. Behavior problems, on the other hand, occur whenever a child wishes to bring them up. The form they take is selected by the child. Usually the teacher and other children are the ones who respond with "correction" given to the child with behavior problems. Teachers feel reactive, not in charge; certainly this is not what was described in their methods class. It is no wonder that most programs developed for dealing with children's problem behaviors focus on reducing these behaviors. Problem behaviors become things that teachers want to control or erase.

Behavior problems are viewed as interruptions of the teaching day that disturb the normal school process. We often think as teachers that when we have to attend to these problem behaviors we are prevented from providing more important academic instruction. Problem behaviors do, in fact, compete with academic instruction. Additionally, they often make teachers feel that the classroom is out of control. If teachers must contend with behavioral instruction as an integral part of their jobs, methods need to be developed that help teachers look at problem behaviors in ways that lead to *instructional* programs that can be effectively implemented in the classroom. This article describes such a method. It is a report of a differentiated programing process developed by the Colorado State Department of Education and the University of Washington. As in all processes, the products produced are in a state of perpetual draft. It is our intent to present a needs-based instructional focus to the education of children with behavior problems, and to solicit input from the field.

Behavior Is Something to Teach, Not Control

Cessna and Adams (1989) have identified the critical components of instruction for handicapped children in schools: differentiated academics, life skills, and developmental/compensatory instruction. Briefly, differentiated academics are the adjustments we make in teaching academic subjects to accommodate various handicapping conditions. Life-management instruction involves managing employment, various environments, and self. Developmental/compensatory instruction focuses on helping children develop previously undeveloped skills or teaching them ways to compensate for their disability.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A central question in providing an appropriate education for children with behavior problems is to decide which developmental/compensatory skills need to be taught. In other words, how do we make *instructional* sense of the behaviors we see? To answer this question, two concepts need to be introduced: behavioral intent and replacement behaviors.

Behavioral intent is the functional relationship between the behaviors we observe and the outcome desired by the child. When a child acts, even with behaviors that we view as disordered, s/he acts to achieve a result. This desired result or outcome can be viewed as the intent of the behavior. It is, of course, an inferred intent similar to the communicative intent of pragmatics in language. The important feature for instruction is the relationship between the intent and the series of behaviors that are observed. It is the connection between outcome and event that is critical to providing effective instruction of social behaviors.

Replacement behaviors are appropriate behaviors you teach a child to use to achieve her/his behavioral intent, new behaviors that the child can substitute for her/his problem ones yet still reliably achieve the desired outcome. It is the connection between problem behaviors, behavioral intents, and replacement behaviors that will help teachers identify the developmental/compensatory curriculum for children with behavioral disorders.

The concept of replacement behaviors is a deceivingly simple one. A thorough discussion of what replacement behaviors are (and what they are not) is required if teachers are going to adequately shift their methods of teaching to one of instruction rather than control.

What Are Replacement Behaviors?

The concept of replacement behaviors is based upon two assumptions. First, behavior is purposeful and achieves a desired outcome for the child. It is the achievement of this outcome that shapes the specific form of a behavior. Briefly stated, behavioral intent (purpose) defines behaviors (forms). The relationship between intent, forms, and outcome achieved is a shorthand summary of the effects of perceptions, previous learning, existing stimuli, and reinforcers. This concept does not contradict the notions of behavioral analysis; rather it expands them to include the connection between intents and outcomes necessary to form an instructional paradigm. (See Neel and Cessna, in press, for a more detailed description and analysis of this question.)

Second, outcomes sought by children with behavior problems are not pathological. A recent study by Neel et al. (1989) asked a group of teachers, school psychologists, social workers, and school administrators to identify their list of most problematic behaviors. The results of this study showed that when these problem behaviors were analyzed for their outcome (intent), an overwhelming majority of them were used to achieve outcomes desired by *all* children and adults. In short, problem behaviors are inappropriate forms of nonpathological intents. A major implication for teachers is that the outcomes (intents) achieved by problem behaviors are valid for all children; thus they are a legitimate focus of classroom instruction.

If we assume that the behavioral intent demonstrated by the child's behavior is valid, then our instructional task shifts from controlling behaviors to teaching alternative behaviors to reach the same outcome. In other words, we need to focus on ways to teach replacement behaviors that are more socially acceptable yet still achieve the same outcome for the child. Problem behaviors do not need to be eliminated by environmental management and control. Rather, they are appropriate forms used to reach valid outcomes that need to be replaced with forms that are more socially acceptable in the settings where they appear.

Currently, teachers often fail to view problem behavior as an instructional task involving replacing forms of behavior. They tend to focus on reducing the behavior or substituting a behavior that will achieve a *different* outcome. For example, many programs focus on punishing a particular behavior (e.g., response cost) and/or rewarding a behavior that competes effectively with the problem one (e.g., on task, spelling, etc.). Other programs design interventions that prevent the problem from occurring. Class assignments are designed to prevent frustration, provide feedback at a high frequency, and adjust the cues and commands to avoid vagueness and ambiguity. When the problem behaviors reduce in number, the program is viewed as a success. In all of these cases, the validity of the behavioral inferred intent is denied. When *the* curriculum emanates from the teacher, the instructional needs of the child are often discounted or missed altogether. The curriculum for children with behavior problems (and we would argue the same for all children) must originate from the child. Teachers need to keep their instructional focus on effectively replacing problem behaviors with ones that are more socially acceptable while keeping intended outcomes intact. Only when we accept problem behaviors presented by the child as diagnostic data for needed instruction will we be able to make sense out of them.

Replacement behaviors are not synonymous to the *fair pairs* described in the behavioral literature, a term given to instructional programs that reduce the problem behavior directly while increasing another competing behavior. Such a technique "works" if the only measure of success is the reduction of problem behaviors in a particular context. As Gresham (1986) points out, the success observed is fleeting when the conditions and/or settings are changed. Our position is that fair pairs are legitimate instructional strategies on the intent level in that a fair pair attempts to induce a child to select another desired intent. For example, if a child began complaining in order to escape an assignment, a fair pair would be to "trade" a method of gaining attention or praise (e.g., completing correct math problems) for the need to escape. Included in the deal would be the addition of rewards and other environmental adjustments that would reduce the need to escape. If the child accepted the trade, then the problem behavior would likely be reduced. What would not be changed, however, would be the behaviors (forms) used to escape when the need for escape returned in another context. It is at this level (forms) that a focus on replacement behaviors is required.

Analyzing Outcome: The First Step

The importance of analyzing the outcome of a series of behaviors cannot be overemphasized. Without accurate knowledge of the outcome achieved, it is likely that the instructional intervention designed will be at best ineffective, and at worst will contribute to creating a more severe problem.

The example of truancy will illustrate the importance of outcome analysis as the first step in teaching replacement behaviors. Most schools have one or more children who occasionally self-schedule their school day. Often they stay home for any reason, or they leave school when the mood suits them. Many

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

enter class late, and a few of the more bold leave class early. The major intervention for truancy is suspension and/or expulsion. (If you won't come, then you can't come!) When groups of teachers are asked if they think suspension/expulsion is an effective intervention, they resoundingly vote "no". We would suggest that for some children it is very effective, and for others it is not. Why? First, you need to look at the possible intents of the behavior. Here are three: escape from work or some bully; gratification from some activity elsewhere (e.g., getting high, going to the mall, etc.); or attention (three phone calls, two visits, and a letter to mother). If the desired intent is the first two, then suspension is not the instructional intervention of choice. It is, in fact, contributing to the problem. If, however, the intent is attention, then suspension may be one viable component of the instructional intervention (assuming that you can control attention at home), providing that you are teaching socially acceptable ways to achieve attention at the same time.

The point is that without knowledge of the outcome the behavior is designed to achieve, we are as likely to add to the problem as correct it. By analyzing the intent of the behavior we can determine which set of replacement behaviors to teach (in this case, behaviors that get attention). Remember, we are assuming that the presence of the behavior "legitimizes" the need for teaching ways to get attention. The instructional program would include the teaching of ways to gain attention (replacement forms) while keeping the access to attention (desired outcome) open. This allows the curriculum to be driven by the instructional needs of the child. It truly becomes an individualized program based upon the ever changing social needs of the child.

Outcome Analysis Worksheet: A Draft

The following is a list of steps you can use to analyze a series of behaviors to determine its behavioral intent (outcome). This is a draft in process. It has been tried with a set of teachers in Washington and Colorado with encouraging success. This process is evolving as we collect more information on its use. We offer it here as our best thinking to the moment.

Step 1: State the problem in your own words (running narrative).
Step 2: Break up the narrative into discrete incidents. Each incident should include a problem behavior and what a child and others did until the event ended. If your narrative only has one event, see if you can remember other events that are causing problems for the child.
Step 3: If one or more of the events listed are not complete (e.g., has a problem behavior and description of the actions of a child and others until event ends), gather needed information to complete it (them).
Step 4: Add any additional incidents you feel are important that were left out in Steps 1-3.
Step 5: Select the probable outcome (intent) for the child for each incident (use accompanying definition sheet as a guide).
Step 6: Group outcome(s) from Step 5.
Step 7: List theme(s) [largest group from Step 5 becomes your major instructional theme; smaller group(s) become your secondary theme(s)].
Step 8: Select formal, informal, and environmental adaptations necessary for primary and secondary themes.
Step 9: Plan your instruction.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEFINITION SHEET

Outcome	Description
Power/Control	When child seeks control of events and/or situations; characterized by child acting to stay in situation and keep control of events.
Protection/ Escape/ Avoidance	When child seeks to avoid a task, activity; escape a consequence; terminate or leave a situation; when a child seeks to avoid danger, pain, or uncomfortable situations or events.
Avoidance	When child seeks to avoid a task, activity; escape a consequence; terminate or leave a situation; when a child seeks to avoid danger, pain, or uncomfortable situations or events.
Attention	When a child becomes the focus of a situation; draws attention to self; result is the child puts herself/himself in the foreground of a situation; discriminates self from group for a period of time; distinguishing feature is that of becoming the focus as the end product of the behavior.
Acceptance/ Affiliation	Child seeks to connect/relate with others; mutuality of benefit is present.
Expression of Self	Child seeks forum of expression; could be statement of needs or perceptions; demonstration of skills and talents.
Gratification	Child seeks self-reward/enjoyment; distinguishing characteristic is self-directed; others may play agent role, but self-reward/enjoyment is central outcome of activity.
Justice/Revenge	Child seeks settlement of difference; restitution or contrition are usually involved; settling the score.

REFERENCES

Cessna, K. K., & Adams, L. (1989). *Expanded curricula for needs based instruction.* Unpublished manuscript, Colorado Department of Education, Denver.

Gresham, F. (1986). Conceptual issues in the assessment of social competence in children. In P. Strain, M. Guralnick, & H. Walker (Eds.), *Children's social behavior* (pp. 143-179). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Neel, R. S., & Cessna, K. K. (in press). *Behavioral intent: Needs based instruction for children with behavior problems.* Denver: Colorado Department of Education.

Neel, R. S., Cessna, K. K., Swize, M., Borock, J., Meadows, N., Scott, C., & Parker, G. (1989). *School behavior problems: A preliminary taxonomy.* Unpublished manuscript, Colorado Department of Education, Denver.

Richard S. Neel, Professor of Special Education and Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, 206 Miller Hall, DQ-12, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195

K. Kay Cessna, Senior Consultant, Colorado Department of Education, 201 E. Colfax, Denver, Colorado 80203

BEST COPY AVAILABLE